Volume 30

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF MARCH, A.D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P.M.

- - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Wednesday, March 29, 1950.
2:00 o'clock, p.m.

- - - - - -

2:00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw to the attention of the House, please, that the arrangments which we have planned for the presenting and receiving of the portraits of the two former honourable Speakers and the honourable Mr. Kennedy will have to be changed. You may recall we sent notices out yesterday that the presentation would take place tomorrow in my office. Unfortunately, both Mr. Stewart and Mr. Hepburn are enjoying the sunshine of Florida. We had been given to understand they would be back in time for this presentation. Therefore, we shall have to delay the presentation until they return, so the arrangements for tomorrow at 1:30 will be cancelled.

The portraits, by the way, of the two former honourable Speakers are hanging in the Speaker's Lobby, and the

portrait of Col. Kennedy is at present reclining in my office, but I hope to be relieved of the responsibility of caring for it as soon as possible, because I want to see that it is properly preserved.

Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. A. A. Mackenzie (York North): Mr.Speaker, I beg leave to present the Report of the Standing Committee on Printing, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Mackenzie, from the Standing Committee on Printing, to the members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario;

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Printing begs leave to present the following as its report:

Your Committee recommends that the supplies allowance per member for the current Session of the Assembly be fixed at the sum of $25.00 and that, to meet the convenience of the members, a cheque for that amount be issued to each member of the Assembly in order the he may make the desired purchases in his own constituency.

Also that an allowance be authorized and a cheque issued to each of the full-time daily newspaper representatives covering the present Session of the Legislative Assembly, as nominated by the Press Gallery and approved by Mr. Speaker.

Your Committee recommends that copies of the Candian Parliamentary Guide, the Canadian Almanac and the Canada Year Book be purchased for distribution

to the members of the Assembly.

Your committee recommends that Departmental Reports and Sessional Papers for the current year be printed in the following numbers:

Public Accounts		2,250
Estimates		1,250
Lands and Forests (including Game & Fisheries Report)		1,450
Mines		250
Legal Offices		650
Superintendent of Insurance:	Abstract	750
	Detailed	950
Registrar of Loan Corporations:	Abstract	400
	Detailed	650
Public Works		325
Highways		600
Labour		1,100
Education		1,250
University of Toronto		325
Births, Marriages and Deaths		3,000
Prisons and Reformatories		890
Ontario Training Schools		1,015
Public Welfare		750
Liquor Control Board		1,000
Department of Agriculture (Minister)		1,900
Department of Agriculture (Statistics)		3,250
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission		262
Ontario Municipal Board		900
Hydro-Electric Power Commission		3,700
Provincial Auditor		700
Workmen's Compensation Board		1,250
Ontario Veterinary College		1,750

Provincial Police	400
Niagara Parks Commission	450
Fire Marshal	1,450
Civil Service Commissioner	450

The matter of printing the report of the Select Committee on Conservation was referred to your Committee by the Assembly on Monday the 27th instant. After giving the matter due consideration, and having the advantage of the advice of Mr. Thomas (Elgin), chairman of the Committee, and Mr. Oliver, one of the Committee members, your Committee recommends that 5000 copies of the report be printed for general distribution nd that any Department of Government desiring to distribute copies, be authorized to have the same printed and distributed at the expense of such Department.

Your Committee further recommends that a special appropriation be made to cover the cost of printing the report and that every effort be made to have the report ready for distribution not later than July 1st, 1950.

An application was received from the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors asking that the book entitled "A Report of Decisions in Cases arising out of the Municipal Drainage Act" which was published in 1916, be reprinted for distribution.

The Committee considered that the usefulness of the book in question would be impaired by the amendments to the Drainage Act at present proposed and by any action taken under authority of the Committee on Conservation and decided to lay the

request on the Table for the present.

Your Committee recommends that all Sessional papers required to be printed be printed and made available to be tabled in the House not later than at the first Session of the Assembly following the end of the previous fiscal year and that all Departments of Government and the King's Printer be notified to that effect.

Your Committee desires to express its appreciation of the value to members of the Assembly of the book entitled "Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario" by Alex C. Lewis, Clerk of the Assembly and recommends that he be asked to re-edit the book and bring it up-to-date for the convenience of the Members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. A. Mackenzie, Chairman

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I rise to speak against the adoption of the report at this time. I do so because in my opinion the Committee was not in a position properly to deal with the questions that arise and should arise before a Committee of that sort.

It was my painful experience today to walk out of the meeting of this Committee. I did so for the following reasons: hon. members of this House have from time to time raised the question of the lateness of the publication of the Report and other Sessional Papers that are tabled. Special emphasis was placed on that point by the hon. member for Waterlow (Mr. Brown) this year. When the Committee managed to get a quorum this morning, I raised this question, feeling that that is a proper place to discuss and find out the reason for the delay, whether it was due to the lateness of the Departments in preparing their

reports, or whether it was a result of a backlog formed in the printing shop. To my amazement, Mr. Speaker, the King's Printer was not present and there was therefore no opportunity, in my opinion, to secure the information desired.

I do recognize that the Clerk of the Assembly, who was present, tried to the best of his ability to supply the information, but I do most respectfully suggest that the Clerk of the Assembly has so many duties and obligations that he could not possibly be fully informed on the King's Printer's office.

May I state further, Mr. Speaker, that the King's Printer is responsible for the expenditure of very large amounts of public funds in the printing of almost everything issued by the Government and all its Departments, and it was my feeling, and I expressed it, that at least the King's Printer should be present to answer the questions hon. members of the Committee may care to put to him. That is a fair way of doing it.

However, the King's Printer was not called, and I want to say that he was in his office at that time, only across the hallway from where the Committee on Printing and Stationery met. During the fire drill we met the King's Printer as he left his office and mingled with the rest of us on that side of the building.

I then moved that the King's Printer be asked to appear before the Committee to answer questions hon. members of the Committee may care to put. Unfortunately, the vote was not in favour of calling him. This, too, I suggest, is very unusual. I think some members did not vote, and at least one member who voted against, tells me now he was not quite aware what the motion meant and he voted the other way. It is true there was not a majority for calling him, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is most unusual for a standing committee of this House meeting to discharge the responsibilities that this House has

placed upon it to find itself in a position where the person in charge of the branch in question should be absent and that the Committee should not be able to get him to appear before it.

I do not know whether the King's Printer gives the printing of the government to one printer, or to two or three printing houses. I do not know whether the entire printing trade is given an opportunity to bid for whatever printing we may have. I do not know whether the failure to ask for such public bids and the failure to distribute printing orders is responsible for the delay in the issuance of the Reports of Proceedings. I do not even know, Mr. Speaker, whether the King's Printer is capable of estimating prices and costs of printing. I do know the late Mr. Bowman, who was King's Printer, attended the meetings of the Committee on Printing and Stationery, as a matter of fact, the meeting used to take place in his own office, where he could easily, as he often did, turn his files and produce letters, estimates and so on. Furthermore, the late Mr. Bowman was an expert printer who knew printing as well as any man. I do not know that the present King's Printer is a printer. I am inclined to think he is not. That is not to be held against him, and I am making no disparaging remarks about the present holder of that office, but I do submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is unusual and, from my point of view, entirely wrong for the King's Printer to refuse to appear -- or, at least, not to make an effort to appear before a meeting of the Committee that is supposed to deal with his Department, with the expenditures of moneys, and with all the aspects of the question that surround his office and his branch of the government.

I suggest therefore that this report should not now be adopted and I move, seconded by Mr. MacLeod:

That the Report of the Committee on Printing and Stationery be not now adopted, but that it be referred back to the sub-committee with instructions to call upon the King's Printer to appear before a properly called meeting of the Committee so that he may provide such information and data as may be requested by the Committee in the proper conduct of its business.

MR. A. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I might say I tried to be very fair indeed this morning.

MR. SALSBERG: You were.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you. At the meeting of the Standing Committee on Printing, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) moved that the King's Printer be asked to appear before the Committee and be examined as to reasons for the delay in printing and distributing some of its Parliamentary Reports, and as no other member of the Committee supported the motion, I declared the motion lost.

MR. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Well, that was good enough.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion; it does seem to me that we are faced with a rather extraordinary situation, because to my knowledge, none of the Standing Committees of this House that meet are ever without the services of the officials of the Department concerned. The Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests, the Deputy Minister of Mines, the Deputy Ministers of other Departments are always present, not on request, but in the line of duty. I have found the Deputy Ministers in this province are only too eager to avail themselves of opportunities to supply hon. members of this House with information, as are most hon. Ministers. Now, why

it should be necessary for an hon. member of this House to move the motion moved by my colleague (Mr. Salsberg) in that Committee this morning is beyond me. I think the King's Printer should have been there as a matter of practice, as a matter of duty, and having regard to some of the questions that were raised in this House by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown), it seems to me it was most desirable that the King's Printer should be at that meeting to answer the very questions raised in this House by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown).

I think the official concerned, the King's Printer, is doing himself a very grave dis-service in not appearing before that Committee of his own volition.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Well, did he know anything about it?

MR. MacLEOD: I beg your pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did he know anything about the meeting?

MR. SALSBERG: He knew of the meeting.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, he certainly must have known that a meeting of the Committee on Printing was being held.

MR. SALSBERG: He peeked in for a minute, and walked away.

MR. MacLEOD: He looked in, he knew the meeting was taking place. It is difficult for me to believe that it would have escaped the attention of the King's Printer that the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) a few days ago raised certain matters that concerned his particular Department of Government, and I think he should have been there. I think it was somebody's duty to see that he was there; that otherwise it was simply impossible for that committee to be properly informed in the carrying out of its duties, and I would myself like to see agreement in the Chamber, in the House, this afternoon that the meeting should be re-convened and that the King's Printer should stand ready to supply whatever information is

required.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take this opportunity to comment on one recommendation in the report, just in case things should move so rapidly I will not have a chance to speak on the motion again -- I mean after you put the amendment. I notice a recommendation there to the effect that -- what is the title of Major Lewis' book? "Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario". One of the recommendations is that "Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario" by Alec. G. Lewis, K.C. should be re-edited. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that should be done until the government has taken some steps to reconsider, or consider perhaps I should say, the report of the Select Committee of this House appointed a year or two ago, maybe three years ago, which brought in some recommendations for revising the Rules. If it is now considered that those recommendations were unwise, then I suggest there should be a new Select Committee established to revise Rules of the House to bring them up-to-date, because I think you, Mr. Speaker, and those who have preceded you, have from time to time been placed in a rather difficult position because of precedents that have been established beyond the Rules as now stated in that book.

That volume, edited by Major Lewis, is of course based upon rules that have been made by the House from time to time, and I think it would be very wrong,—certainly the author of the book should not on his own responsibility change the rules that the Assembly made for itself, and if we were to proceed now with a re-edit job, we might find ourselves next Session confronted with the necessity of making certain changes which would call for the issuing of an entirely different volumne. I think therefore any re-editing of the present rule book should be held up until such time as we have considered the report of that Committee, which was never considered by the House at

any time, or until such time as a new Select Committee of the Legislature has had an opportunity to go over the Rules of the House very carefully and make recommendations for changes in line with experience gained since the rules were completed sometime back.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has got an entirely wrong impression of the duties of the King's Printer. He is not a policy-maker; he only carries out the recommendations that are made to him by the Committee or by the Deputy Ministers of Departments and makes arrangements for having the number of these various volumes that he is told to get prepared at the earliest possible moment.

There was an insinuation made that the number of printing firms had decreased, and I would like to clear that up in the minds of the House right now and for all time.

In 1940, we had printing contracts with 240 printers in the province of Ontario; today we have contracts with 644. The printing job is distributed as wisely and to as many papers in the province as can be done. Some papers are equipped to handle certain types of work, other papers are not, and in that way, we cannot have each paper do every type of work, because they are not equipped to do it.

The major contracts for printing, Sessional Papers and Bills and Orders and so on, are advertised widely throughout the province and are awarded on competitive bids for a five-year term. The same policy is followed as regards printing of the Ontario Gazette. It is also widely advertized on competitive bids and given on a five-year contract.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, since I am a member of the Printing Committee and was present this morning, I felt I too should perhaps make a few remarks.

I just wanted to say the King's Printer was on call and was available to that committee if they felt like calling him in, but the committee, as I gathered it, felt that since the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) was the member who had brought this matter to our attention in the House and therfore to a great extent was responsible for the discussion, and since he felt that he had all the information that was necessary, the committee felt it was not at all important that we call in the King's Printer.

MR. SALSBERG: But before he had the information.

MR. CATHCART: And as a result of that, the chairman called for a vote, and with the exception of the one hon. member who has already spoken, they voted unanimously that for this particular matter it was unnecessary to bring the King's Printer into the meeting.

I might say in regard to the volume edited by our Clerk, there was an expression of appreciation passed at the meeting with the feeling that this volume probably is the one that can be considered as possibly the most important volume to hon. members of the Legislature that we might have in our library. As a result of that, we felt we should express our appreciation, and ask our Clerk to continue on and bring that particular volume up-to-date.

I think that is all I have to say on the matter.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): The hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) was mentioning a little while ago something about the method or the number of printing firms, and he referred to the bid system. I would like to ask him, in the seeking of those bids, what the provision is about labour conditions; is there a fair-wage clause in there; is there a requirement for union conditions, or just what is the system which is used when you are offering the long-term contracts to the printers?

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to answer that.

I think that is the case, but with the hon. member's (Mr. Park) permission, I will certainly obtain information and give it to him.

MR. PARK: I will ask for it on Estimates. Probably that would be better.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, no doubt now the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) will have an opportunity to inform himself on those points before his Estimates are reached.

May I just say with respect tothe discussion which has taken place here today that I am not myself too happy about the report of the Committee. I think the King's Printer himself cannot be charged with any default in failing to appear at the committee meeting. The difficulty is this, that this committee has met only once. I understand that the committee met only this morning and until it met it had no chairman, no one as far as I know had any authority to instruct the King's Printer or any other civil servant to attend before the committee, so I do not think any criticism whatever can be assigned to the King's Printer for failing to be there.

Having said that much, may I add that it probably would have been much better if the committee had met previously for organization purposes, selected its chairman and decided how it was going to proceed. It may be the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was the only member who wished to have the King's Printer before the committee. I do not know, but as a rule, the committees of this House when theymeet do not operate on party lines, which is probably a very good thing, and my feeling if I were a member of the committee, would be that if any member of the committee, no matter what party he belonged to, wanted to ask a question which seemed to be relevant of the appropriate civil servant, he should be given that opportunity, so that I am not at all clear why the

request was rejected. We have been told that nobody else favoured it, but that indicates no reason whatever why it was rejected.

With regard to the re-editing of the book known as "Parliamentary Procedure for Ontario", the invaluable book which we all possess and which I suppose most of use from time to time, I must say it would seem to me very rash to re-edit or re-publish that book at the present time when there has been so much general agreement on all sides that the rules call for some review or reconsideration. It may be that hon. members on the other side of the House and some hon. members on this side of the House do not entirely concur with the report of the Select Committee three years ago. That may be so, but I suggest there was general agreement, and I think there still is, that our rules should be brought up-to-date, and that there is considerable room for improvement. To re-issue the book at a time when that is clear and when it has been clear for some years, does not seem to me to be a very wise suggestion, but I understand it is part of the committee report.

(Take B-1 follows)

I am going to conclude by saying on matters of such importance it would be better if the committee held an organization meeting at an earlier stage, to know how it would proceed, and then I do not think we would be in the difficulty which has arisen today.

In any event, I would be interested to hear whether the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) thinks the matter has been satisfactorily disposed of and what his attitude is toward the plea of the hon. members who have made it, and if he had the opportunity to question the King's Printer. The present King's Printer, like the previous King's Printer, has always been most co-operative and my guess is that he would be glad to answer any questions.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I have listened very carefully to what has been said. The King's Printer is there and is always available, as is any other person who is in the employ of the government. He is always available for a personal visit or if the committee desires to subpoena him. I feel loath to disturb the decision of the committee. It is representative of all hon. members of the House, and in their wisdom they thought not fit to ask the King's Printer to attend. They heard the arguments on the matter under discussion. I do not know everything that transpired at their meetings, but in any event the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Brown) and some of the hon. members on this side were interested in certain matters and in their wisdom decided not to call the King's Printer. I would not try to sit in judgment on that; it is a democratic committee and it is really a non-partisan committee, and they determine matters as they come up. I think there is much to be said

in agreement with what my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) has said that perhaps in the organization of these committees they might be held earlier. I know that the Printing Committee has been, in the past, a committee of form, and usually met on only one occasion. That has been the practice. What has arisen has been somewhat of a surprise. What has been said might be considered at the next Session.

One of the reasons for the delay was waiting until the report of the Conservation Committee was filed or the committee would have been held earlier. It was held because the largest job was the printing of that report and as I understand it from the Clerk of the House, the matter was held over pending the filing of this report adopted yesterday. The printing of reports and getting reports out has, in the last few years, been a great task. I, myself, had to do with the re-negotiation of certain of the contracts which had been given and passed, because of the terrific increase in the price of paper and everything going into the printing of these various reports. It is my recollection that much of the printing is done now by the same firms as when my hon. friends opposite were in office.

There has not been too much search on the part of business for government printing, because it perhaps is not a particularly remunerative form of printing, and we have had a lot of difficulty in getting this done. I can assure the hon. members of this House that we are most anxious to get the reports out as soon as possible. I can only mention the difficulties we had in getting out the Public Accounts, the printing of that was tremendous and getting it out and filed on the first day of the Session is really "something." I remember when I was in the Opposition, complaining about this matter, and suggesting the accounts should be filed before the opening. I can assure the hon. members that I have endeavoured to do that.

I believe it would be much better to get the public accounts long before the Session, but it has not always been possible to do that under present conditions. I think this debate will have served its purpose with the explanation I have given, and we will do all we can to hasten the printing.

When I was Minister of Mines we had a great number of publications and had great difficulty in getting them printed, and had to take them in the order of importance. What was important to some might not have been important to others. My information is that there will be an improvement and there has been an improvement in the last year or two. I would say that two years ago it was difficult to get the Orders of the Day printed and the Bills up to the House. We have done much better. I notice today that most of the Bills introduced yesterday, lengthy Bills, are printed and I did not think that would be possible.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): What about the question of the rule book? We have the forestry committees report, and I do not think it is a satisfactory report.

MR. FROST: I think there is something to be said in connection with that section of the report. I am satisfied that perhaps the hon. members of the Committee did not fully understand the situation. It might be well to delete that section of the report and adopt the balance of the report as it stands.

When it comes to matters of the rules of the House, I am also interested. In the last year I have not been able to give it much consideration; there have been other matters to consider. There are things which might be revised and we are experimenting this year on private members' Bills and I would like to have the views of the hon. members of the House on

this problem. There are some things in the rules that would bear revision, and what has been said will help us later on.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): In that connection, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is anxious to get the views of the House, would he consider setting up a Select Committee to work on that between now and the next Session.

MR. FROST: We have the report of the previous committee, I do not know whether it was filed. I admit, myself, I must plead guilty of having not given it much consideration. I think I would prefer to give some consideration to the report which was made previously, and perhaps call in the leaders of the parties and have a round-table discussion, and see if we could bring about a solution.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When the report goes back to the committee, it would save the necessity of amending it.

MR. FROST: You might do this; adopt the report on the understanding that the section of the report, due to the circumstances which I explained, will not be proceeded with, and we will look at the whole question of the rules of the House.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): In view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that this discussion will have served a good purpose, and conferences will take place in the future, I am prepared, with the agreement of the seconder and the approval of the House, to withdraw my amendment to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is hardly necessary for the approval of the House, in view of the fact the amendment was not officially accepted by the Speaker. If it is satisfactory to the mover and seconder, it will not be accepted.

MR. SALSBERG: Will that keep it from being on the record?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like it on the record for the reasons I gave.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of procedure, are you not obliged to read the amendment before the debate proceeds?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I do not think it is necessary. My ruling would be that I have the right to reserve the decision on any amendment because I was not notified the amendment would be submitted. I am protected in that way, I think, if I need any protection.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Is not everything in this House on a Bill supposed to be in Hansard?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The words of the hon. member, will be included in Hansard.

MR. NIXON: The other day I made a definite motion in regard to a Bill which you will recall, and that motion did not appear in Hansard at all.

MR. SALSBERG: That happens very often.

MR. NIXON: This was a very definite matter and you did not read the resolution and it did not appear in Hansard, and that was the explanation, that you have not read it. It was my understanding that everything was to be included in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The mere fact that the Speaker does not accept a motion, when the motion is made it should certainly appear in Hansard. I am sorry that this situation has arisen. If you will point it out to me I will see that it is corrected.

MR. FROST: It leaves out a lot of things we do say, and puts in a lot of things we do not say.

MR. MacLEOD: What is going to be done about that? It has become serious.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the assurance given that there will be an improvement in the matter we discussed, I am prepared, with the agreement of the seconder, and the approval of the House, to withdraw my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Salsberg is prepared to have the amendment withdrawn with the sanction of the House.

Amendment withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): I would like to mention one thing so far as the making of reports are concerned, which was mentioned by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). Last year I brought to the attention of the House that we were asked to vote a great deal in connection with educational systems. Last year we had the 1947 report a day or two before the estimates were considered. This year we have not the 1948 reports for the Department of Education. It seems to me that in a matter so important a special effort should be made to get into our hands a copy of the report so that we can have the one which was preceding the fiscal year under consideration, and I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and the government, that it is useless, in my opinion, to ask this House to consider estimates of some $56 million dollars this year, without having the benefit of the report even for 1948. I think the King's Printer or the responsible department should explain why it is necessary for a year to go by without having that report, when we have to consider such an important estimate.

I suggest that something be done to speed up this situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE ONTARIO-MANITOBA BOUNDARY ACT

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Express the consent of the Legislature of Ontario to an Alteration of the Limits of the Province", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the description of the Ontario-Manitoba boundary in The Ontario Boundaries Extension Act (Canada) of 1912 was prepared from the best information available at that time.

The new description of the boundary is determined from its position as it has been surveyed on the ground. The amended description results in a slight increase in the territory of Ontario.

The Bill has been cleared with Ottawa and confirmed as being approved by Legislative Council. The federal Bill provides that the consent of the provinces shall first be given after which the federal Bill will be introduced in the House of Commons. The Ontario Bill, section 2, provides for the Act to come into force by proclamation. This is by mutual arrangement with Manitoba who have provided similarly in their Bill, as it was thought it would be a good idea to have the two copies proclaimed the same day.

(Page B-8 follows)

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

HON. CHALRES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act", and that same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Could we have some information on this.

MR. DALEY: This is a Bill which in no way affects the principle of workmen's compensation. I am advised by the legal counsel of the Board that because of the many regulations, and the study of them, these changes are necessary. There are no changes, but merely to bring into line the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 104 and 105.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the honl Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) permit a question. A number of the hon. members must be curious about the other Bills on which notice has been given. Notice has been standing, in some cases, for several weeks. We are now, presumably, getting near the end of the Session and these Bills have not yet been introduced. There might be good and sufficient reason; I do not know. But all this should not happen within the last two days of the Session.

MR. FROST: If it had not been for the illness of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) they would be all in now. I have spoken to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) each day, by telephone. He has had a bad cold and a fever. Last night his temperature was normal, but I urged upon him not to come in today. I thought we might go ahead with estimates

and get these cleaned up so that we could deal with the other matters next week. These matters here on the Order Paper are routine matters, for instance, the Act to Amend the Labour Act.

There are a number of things of a similar nature. Some of the Acts will not be proceeded with. I know that the Boiler and Pressure Act of 1950 will not be proceeded with. That will be withdrawn. The others are more or less of routine nature. There is nothing of consequence.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In connection with the illness of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter , should not the whole House adjourn and commit themselves to the doctors' care?

MR. FROST: Have you a high temperature?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No.11 , "An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend the Conservation Authorities Act, 1946".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE LEGITIMATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend the Legitimation Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE PHARMACY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 108, "An Act to amend the Pharmacy Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund", Mr. Frost.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 32.

THE TOWN OF PARRY SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-second Order, second reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound", Mr. Johnston.

MR. ALLISTER JOHNSTON (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 33.

THE CONGREGATION OF THE PRIESTS OF THE SACRED HEART

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-third Order, second reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to Incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart", Mr. Calder.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to Incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND TRUST COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fourth Order, second reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Companies", Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Chartrand, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Companies".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 49.

THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 50.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fiftieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. WM. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to call Orders 51 to 54 inclusive. Three of these items are printed. I want to give an opportunity to the financial critics on the opposite side of the House to speak to the Controller of Provincial Revenue because they are of a technical nature. I will hold them over so that the Opposition may have an opportunity to go to see the Controller.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that you now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I will call Order No. 5.

His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, has been advised of the purpose of the resolution, approved it and recommends it to the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolved by Mr. Doucett:

That, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may pay out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund towards the cost of drainage

work.

(a) where the work is in a county, thirty-three and one-third per centum of the cost; or

(b) where the work is in a municipality in a territorial district or a provisional county, sixty-six and two thirds per centum of the cost; or

(c) where the work is in a territorial district tut not in a municipality, eighty per centum of the cost,

as provided by Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act."

Resolution agreed to.

(Take C follows)

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Private Bills. Order No. 30.

THE CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa".

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to; schedule agreed to.

Bill No. 21 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 31.

THE CITY OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-first Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston".

Section 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to; preamble agreed to; schedules "A" and "B" and "C" agreed to.

Bill No. 32 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 38.

THE K.V.P. COMPANY LIMITED

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the K.V.P. Company Limited".

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, you will recall this Act was in Committee the other day, and I asked that the matter be allowed to stand, for an amendment which the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) had in mind.

There would be no urgency in ordinary course in connection with this Act, but for the fact that, I think the 4th of April is the deadline in connection with an injunction which was the matter lying behind this Act.

Up there, the living and being of that community are dependent upon the action of this House.

In the Act itself, provision was made, as will be noted,

in subsection 1 for conserving the rights of the plaintiffs to claim damages which have occurred, damages which may be presently occurring, up to the date of the injunction, which is the 4th of April, and for damages which may arise following the 4th of April. In other words, the rights of these persons whoever they may be, on that river to claim for damages are preserved.

In discussing the matter with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) we felt if we could give to the plaintiffs or any other persons who suffer damages, or who may suffer damages on that river, because of pollution, even further rights, we would be prepared to do it. Therefore, after a good deal of consideration, we are asking that an additional section be added to the Act, as section 3, which will have the effect in the alternative, in the bringing of any other or further action for damages, if the plaintiff desires it, their claim for damages can be determined by arbitration.

The first part of the section applies to arbitration which might be agreed upon; however, if the plaintiff desires arbitration, and the form of arbitration cannot be agreed upon, then, by the Act, a judge of the county court of the district may act. That is a right which is totally in addition to any rights which they have at the present time.

As the House knows, we have conserved in this Bill, their rights to damages. This is additional machinery which enables them to claim damages, if they feel they have suffered any, without having to go through the forms which might be involved in a court of law.

I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that this section be added as section 3, and that section 3 be altered to section 4; section 4 to section 5, and section 5 to section 6. The

suggested sectior reads:

" 3. (1) In lieu of bringing an action against the Company, any person who claims that he has suffered or is suffering damage caused by the pollution of the waters of the Spanish River by the Company may, by notice in writing to the Company, require the Company to submit the matter to arbitration on such terms as may be agreed upon.

" (2) Upon receipt of a notice under subsection 1 the Company and the claimant shall forthwith negotiate the terms of the submission and proceed therewith in accordance with its terms.

" (3) If the claimant and the Company are unable to agree as to the terms of the submission, any term in dispute may at any time be referred by either party to the judge of the district court of the district in which the damage claimed occurred, and the judge shall, after hearing both parties, determine any such term and his determination shall be final and shall be acted upon by the parties."

(Page C-4 follows)

Mr. Chairman, this is a right which is quite in addition to any existing rights these parties have. This Legislature is giving to those plaintiffs or claimants for damages caused by the pollution of these waters by this company -- and it is acknowledged there is pollution in that river -- the right to claim damages by arbitration if they desire. It does not say they have to submit this to arbitration; it is purely an additional right given to the people of that community.

It seems to me that is an enlargement which we in this House would not ordinarily give. I think we would take the view that matters should be settled by the courts of the land, and determined by the courts of the land. However, we are dealing in this case with a very unusual situation. If it were not for the matter of the employment of thousands of people at that point, and the importance of it to the maintenance of a very flourishing community in Ontario, I do not think we would have considered passing this Act at all. But here we are dealing with a peculiar and particular situation, and we want to give every conceivable protection to those people who brought action against this company.

May I say again, as I said the other day, that I have a great deal of sympathy for the plaintiffs in this action. I have a great deal of sympathy for any person, big or little, who has common-law rights, or statutory rights, they wish to enforce, and I do not think any of us would want to deal lightly with that. I think this gives to the plaintiffs an added method of protection in the matter, one which they do not need to avail themselves of at all, but if they do want to avail themselves of it, it is there.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, how far have we proceeded with this Bill? Did we agree to section 1 the other day?

MR. FROST: No. I think after the discussion, I asked that it stand over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then, Mr. Chairman, in effect, what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is doing, is moving an amendment by adding a new section.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There are one or two things which should be said about that.

In the first place, it is clearly an alternative remedy, and the matter of litigation can be prosecuted in the ordinary way in the courts. However, it would appear to me if a claimant elected to proceed under the new section 3 by way of arbitration, he would be, in effect, submitting his rights to a district court, because, in the event of failure to agree on the terms of an arbitration, which is sometimes vital, his case would thereupon be determined by a district court judge.

I am wondering -- and the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) who is looking at it from the layman's point of view is wondering -- whether the district court is the best place for such matters to be determined. In other words, what I have in mind is this; there is some advantage in arbitrating matters of this kind, and yet is it not possible that claimants will fear being faced with avoiding arbitration when there is a possibility they may wind up in the county courts? I am afraid they will feel safer before the Supreme Court, or some tribunal more remote from the situation.

What does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) care to say about that?

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, in response to that, I would say we have given a great deal of consideration to that question. There will be objection to any person we name, at any

time. If we appoint a Supreme Court judge, it may be hard to get them, as they are very busy. Again, it might be argued the Supreme Court judge would not have the time to go and look at a situation where pollution exists. He might want to go and visit some place where damages are said to have occured, but he would not have the time.

The plaintiffs -- or claimants -- have three alternatives; first, they have a claim which would go before the courts of the land. That I think would be dependent upon the amount of damages claimed, and would be either in the Supreme Court or the county court. The second alternative is that if there is arbitration, they can agree with the company upon the form of arbitration, either single arbitrator, or three arbitrators, or whatever it may be at the time.

The third alternative would be, of course, if there is to be arbitration and they cannot agree then the county court judge will act.

I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) -- and I think he will agree -- that in such cases as this, the Supreme Court determines that there are damages, and then may refer the assessment of the damages either to the master, or a local master, which in many cases is in the person of the county court judge. So it seems to me that what we are doing is this; if they are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, then we adopt practically the expedient which a court would adopt. In other words, the Supreme Court would say, "This is actionable; there is the right of action for damages in this matter, and we will refer the assessment of the damages to the master or local master,"in which case the county court judge is usually the person, according to the rules, who would handle the matter.

We could refer this matter to a different tribunal. We

might refer it, for instance, to the sulphur fumes arbitrator, up in Sudbury, or to the Municipal Board. There will always be some objection. I have just put these alternatives in there, as fair and reasonable alternatives, provided they cannot agree upon an arbitrator.

That would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, to be a fair arrangement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There must be some reason for the provisions of sub-section 3. In sub-section 3 it is provided there is to be no appeal from the decision of the district court. That, of course, is a departure from the scheme of things under the Arbitration Act, because under the Arbitration Act, the parties can agree that there may be an appeal from the award, and they can also find an avenue of appeal in other sections of the Arbitration Act.

It is the intantion here that the provisions of the Arbitration Act should not apply to this arbitration.

MR. FROST: That is right. This is a special arbitration, set up for them. Otherwise, they have all the rights of a court open to them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for West York (Mr, Millard) knows -- and I think perhap, many of the other hon. members of the House know -- that there has been some confusion about arbitrations other than under the Arbitration Act. For instance, we have certain actions in connection with labour, which call for arbitration, but which has not been expressly made clear, just what the proper precedure will be. I remember I was in one arbitration where one of the leading counsel raised that point, and proposed going to a court to establish that arbitration under the Labour Relations Act is subject to the Arbitration Act in Ontario, which was a point not considered when the Labour Relations Act was prepared.

(Take D Follows)

The only suggestion I am making is that I think hereafter it would be wise where arbitration is referred to as new legislation to make it clear whether the Arbitration Act is to govern or not, whether it is to have any application whatever to the arbitration. I am suggesting that because it has seemed to be doubtful in some previous cases whether the Arbitration Act had any application in the matter. I know you do not want people who are submitting themselves to arbitration to get entangled in the court on the purely academic point of whether or not the Arbitration Act has any application. I do not think you want that to happen here.

I take it from the design of this scheme that the Arbitration Act is to be excluded, it is not to have any part in these arbitrations.

MR. FROST: Wait a minute. I think I am incorrect about that. I will ask the law clerk. I just got this when I came in today, and if I am incorrect, they can correct me.

Section 3 says:

> "If the claimant and the company are unable to agree as to the terms of the submission -- "

That is, the terms of the arbitration --

> "--any matter in dispute may at any time be referred by either party to the judge of the district court of the district in which damages claimed occur, and the judge shall, after hearing both parties, determine such matters -- "

That is the submissions --

> "-- and his determination shall be final and shall be acted upon by the parties."

Which I believe brings into operation the procedure of the Arbitration Act, Chapter 109, so that I think within that all

the rights of the parties are observed. In other words, as I understand this amendment, if the claimant wants arbitration, then he serves notice on the company and if they cannot agree upon the terms and arrangements to be made as to arbitrators and what not in the form of the submission, then they go to the county judge who settles it for them, but it then falls under the Arbitration Act and the rights of appeal and so on in the Arbitration Act are preserved.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then that is quite different. Then the procedure is subject to the Arbitration Act.

MR. FROST: Quite so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What subsection 3 therefore means, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is correct, is that if the parties fail to agree, the district judge will write for them the terms of the submission.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I suppose he would also have the power to name an arbitrator if they cannot agree on that.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then they go to the arbitrator, and the arbitrator would still be free under Section 9 of the Arbitration Act to state a case, a special case, for the opinion of the court, and so on.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am satisfied with that explanation myself, although I can foresee the possibility there may be some argument about the precise meaning of subsection 3. I think I agree with the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) interpretation, but I have sounded that warning, namely that some ingenious counsel, if you do not mention the Arbitration Act, are inclined to romp off to court to get a ruling as to whether or not it is in the application.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that may be the case, but, after all, we have here taken a most unusual course, one which I hope we will not have to take on many occasions. In fact, to my recollection, this is the first occasion this House has ever had to deal with a problem of this sort. I would say it is our job to see that justice is done to these people and if we find that, by kinks or something we have not determined, justice is not being done, we have an appeal here next Session of the Legislature, and I do not think we would hesitate to exercise that right to appeal which they have to us here if things are not working out satisfactorily.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would just add this to what you have said about this subsection 3, that I think some of the language is a little dubious. If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will follow me, just let me direct his attention to the first three lines of subsection 3:

> "If the claimant and the company are unable to agree as to the terms of the submission -- "

So far that is perfectly clear, the reference is undoubtedly to the terms of the submission, not to the terms of the dispute, but to the terms of the submission.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then we have the following words:

> " -- any matter in dispute may at any time be referred by either party -- "

et cetera. It seems to me that "any matter in dispute" is too wide.

MR. FROST: I suggest we strike out the word "matter", and insert the word "term".

MR. JOLLIFFE: That would be much clearer.

MR.FROST: That "Any term in dispute" --

M.R JOLLIFFE: The first words are a condition precedent, but it could be argued that once you had that condition precedent any dispute could be referred to the judge.

MR. FROST: That is fair enough. I think if we change the word "matter" to "term" --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. FROST: Ifyou will just write in "term" there, I will include that in the amendment.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4, formerly section 3:

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr.Chairman, this of course is a very important section, relating to the work to be undertaken by the Research Council, and providing that the cost of such work shall be deemed to be a debt due by the company to the Research Council. So far, so good. Of course the outstanding feature of this thing is that the Bill is silent as to the results which follow. Other than the payment of an account by the company to the Research Council, the Bill is silent as to the implementing of the finding of the Research Council.

What has the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) to say on that point?

MR. FROST: I would say, Mr. Chairman, we have so many ways of seeing this is implemented, that I do not think it is necessary to go into a lot of involved machinery on that point. The fact of the matter is that the findings of the Commission could be implemented, if we had any difficulty next year, by repealing this Act. That could be done.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, it could.

MR. FROST: The fact is, Mr. Chairman, no one knows what the answers to this problem are. What we are faced with is

this: here are these plaintiffs and they have claimed damages and obtained an injunction. The injunction could be very injurious to the public interests. On the other hand, we recognize that nobody here wants to give this company or any other company, but particularly this company, a blank cheque to go ahead and pollute and ruin that stream. The gist of this Bill is simply that by the Act we dissolve the injunction, we retain the right to damages, we protect our right to damages; we enlarge that by the arbitration clause, and then, to protect the public interest, we give the Research Council of Ontario the full power to investigate this case and charge the costs of the investigation to the company.

I would say it will be our duty to see that the provisions or whatever is found out in this matter -- that we are dealing with a lot of unknowns, a lot of intangibles and what not -- it will be our job to see those provisions are enforced and full protection is given within the limit and bounds of reason.

Again there are many things that may arise out of this investigation. I am hopeful we will learn lessons we can apply across Ontario to this matter of pollution, which is immensely serious. I gave consideration to the matter of the enforcement of these things, but after all, remember, the enforcement of it comes down again to the government and to the Legislature. We are just on the fringe of dealing with a big difficulty, one which has been brought into bold relief by this matter.

In the report on conservation, discussion was given to the matter of stream pollution. We are going to study that whole matter, and it is bound to come up here next year. I cannot imagine the plaintiffs are not going to be watchful of their rights in this matter, and I imagine it will come before

this House again at a later date.

I admit what my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) says, but I do not think perhaps at the moment there is any reasonable solution other than what we have done.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I realize we have to be realistic about it, but of course in theory this could happen: The Research Council might carry on its work, let us say from April 1st to July 1st, and by July 1st we might have discovered a satisfactory solution; then the economic factor might enter into, the company might take the position that the solution perhaps is prohibitive financially as far as they were concerned, the government might think otherwise, might think it was quite feasible. The company then could, in theory, defy the government from July 1st of this year until the next Session. That could happen in theory.

May I say this company is apparently conscious of its bargaining power, and believes it to be considerable, because the company has certainly exploited local concern about this matter, and I think has fanned the flames of fear that the plant might be closed down and has made all it possibly could of that feeling.

(Page D-7 follows)

I know even after the solicitors for some of the plaintiffs had publicly undertaken that no application would be made to the court by way of enforcing the injunction, even after that had been made known publicly, the company continued to spread the word that the plant would be closed down April 4th unless the injunction was dissolved. I am not very happy about the way the company expressed the matter. I suppose if the company refuses to implement the solution recommended by the Research Council, there will be another test between the government and the company, with the threat again hanging over the company that: "You will have to close down unless you do what is recommended"; and the company at the same time endeavouring to hold the threat over the government and over the local populace that, "Unless we are given some consideration, we will close down this plant". That will be the sort of "cold war" that may be carried on.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Just like the one at Fort William.

MR. FROST: Well, when I look at the money they are making, they have a considerable stake, apparently.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Fortunately, we are not referring to the Research Council nor the "cold war" at Fort William. However, I do not think we have come to the end of the road by any means in connection with this case.

MR. FROST: I agree with that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think perhaps some of worst headahces may be before us.

MR. FROST: I agree.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the economic factor is an important one, because whatever is recommended by the Research Council is going to cost money, and I do not think the government will

take the same view of it as the company will.

Section 4 to 6 inclusive, formerly sections 3 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 117 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

THE PLANNING ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-ninth Order, House in Committee on section 2 of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend the Planning Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

On section 2.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to section 2, seconded by Mr. Dunbar,

That the present section to be deleted and the following inserted in place thereof:

" (1) Notwithstanding any other general or special Act, where an official plan is in effect, no public works shall be undertaken, and, except as provided in sub-section 2, no by-law shall be passed for any purpose that does not conform therewith;

" (2) The Ontario Municipal Board, upon the application of the council of the municipality for which an official plan is in effect may by its order declare that a by-law of such municipality shall be deemed to conform with the official plan if the Board is of opinion that the by-law conforms with the general intent and purpose of the official plan;

" (3) The procedure upon application to

the Board under sub-section 2 shall be the same as nearly as may be in the case of an application to the Board under section 406 of the Municipal Act".

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): This is the one that was held up?

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It was held back, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not material to me. As far as I am concerned personally, I do not care.

MR. GRIESINGER: Do you want to wait until it has been printed?

MR. DUNBAR: There is not anything to it.

MR. GRIESINGER: I can give you an explanation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Let us hear the explanation.

MR. GRIESINGER: Sub-section 2 of the new section 12 permits the Municipal Board by order to declare that a by-law shall be deemed to conform with an official plan even though it may deviate in details from the official plan, so long as it conforms with the general intent and purpose of the plan. This will avoid the necessity of application to amend the official plan to permit minor deviations that do not affect the broad purpose of the plan.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): May I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger), Mr. Chairman, if he means by that explanation that the Municipal Council in regard to the official plan passed two readings of the by-law and then it has to be approved of by the Municipal Board before third reading?

MR. GRIESINGER: What was that again?

MR. HOUCK: If we pass a by-law in our municipal council,

or any municipal council, does this mean it would get second reading, and then, before it has third reading by the municipal council, have to be approved of by The Municipal Board?

MR. GRIESINGER: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Bill No. 120 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills with amendment and certain Bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report two Bills with amendment and two Bills without amendment, and moves to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Resuming the Department of Lands and Forests.

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 65, the Department of Lands and Forests, vote 106.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman I had no intention whatsoever to enter into the debate that took place yesterday on this item, and I shall not do so now. I do feel, however, that a suggestion would be in order, and that is that in view of the discussion, in view of the fact

that the problem that has arisen in Fort William has become a public issue and individuals, as well as public organizations and bodies are taking stands on the question -- whether that is a result of promotion or other causes, I am not in a position to say, but the fact is public men in public institutions are taking sides on the question, and statements of all sorts are being made. My suggestion therefore is that it would be quite correct, and I do suggest it is also necessary, for the government either through the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) immediately involved or through the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) prepare and make public a statement of its own on the question as a definitive explanation to satisfy both curiosity and interest of a considerably large section of the province. I am not asking that it be done, but I do want to leave the suggestion with the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) for his consideration. I think it would go a long way toward clarifying the situation.

May I, before I sit down, mention the fact that on Sunday I had the pleasure of being in the very fine city of London -- and, by the way, as an aside to an aside, may I also utilize this occasion to thank thehon. local member (Mr. Calder) for the hospitality which he showed both to myself and to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Morrow), both of us arriving in London at the same time.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): You fellows are travelling together now?

MR. SALSBERG: No, the question is whether the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Morrow) who is a government supporter, went to London for the same purpose, and my answer is definitely "no", in fact I inquired whether he was sent along by the government to keep an eye on me for the time I was in London.

(Take E follows)

I want to inform the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) when I arrived there a number of poeple saw me about the same mill. London is disturbed over the situation, and the mayor of London had left the city and was on his way to Fort Williams to stop certain things from taking place, in the best interests of all concerned.

It is not difficult to see the ramifications. I suggest that a statement of the sort I have mentioned, would be timely and very helpful.

Vote 105 agreed to.

On Vote 106.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): On vote 106, I think at the outset there should be some discussion of the general policies of the department. I think this is particulary necessary since, to my knowledge, there has never been given to this House any explanation by the present hon. minister (Mr. Scott) or his predecessor as to why the forestry policy drawn up by this Legislature in 1944 and which was given statutory effect by the Legislature, were abandoned by the government. This is the only opportunity we have to discuss this matter and I point out that the party now in power in this province submitted certain proposals to the people of Ontario in July, 1943, with respect to the forests of this province. Among them there was a pledge that there would be a Forest Resources Commission.

That was point number seven of the twenty-two points and when the new Legislature elected in 1943 confened for the first time, in February 1944, the Speech from the Throne was as follows:

> " Under well-planned, long-term policies of conservation, reforestation and soil control, these areas will be capable of greatly increased production

which will provide employment for many thousands of new workers. An Ontario Forest Resources Commission will be appointed to assume the responsibility for supervising this great development which has now become the largest single source of our provincial income."

That is a quotation from the Throne Sppech on February 22, 1944.

And in the debate which followed, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) spoke to this Legislature at great length on this report, and I should like to quote what the former Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Drew) had to say on this question. After dealing with the importance of the forest industry in the province of Ontario, he said:

" This imposes upon us new needs for careful supervision, new needs for non-political administration of the forest products, and in saying that I am making no suggestion that it is impossible to obtain a fair and proper administration under the ordinary departmental set-up. But we are dealing, when we deal with the forests, with something that requires a long-range program, a longer-range program than any single thing which has yet been m made. There is no other product which we make, there is no other crop we handle, where we have to regard the crop in terms of sixty or seventy or even one hundred years. With that long-range viewpoint it has been found in other countries, particularly in the Scandinavian countries, that we must divorce it from government, because from the very nature of things, things human are temporary in

their existence, no matter how tolerant an Opposition may be, and recognizing that situation, they have created forest resources commissions which establish a long-term policy in which they can project their planning and reforestation, and their maintenance program in terms not merely of years, but of scores of years, and the actual fact is that since they started that system in the last century, the forest stands of Norway, Sweden and Finland have actually increased rather than decreased. If they can maintain that system, surely we can maintain an equally efficient system here, when our markets are immediately at our door, and we do not have to ship across an ocean, even at the very low shipping rates involved in the case of Scandinavian shipping lines.

" In the United States, also, where their cutting has gone to a far greater degree than ours, such as to destroy many of their forests, they, too, in many of their states have found this a most staisfactory method, and therefore, in answer to the query as to what we propose to do, I may say in accordance with the undertakings we gave, there will be a Bill introduced in this Legislature to create forest resource commissions with full administrative powers, which will be in the hands of men who will be divorced from the active legislative responsibilities, and who will be called upon to institute here in Ontario forestry practices in keeping with the needs of this great province of ours."

That speech preceded the introduction of a piece of legislation.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): There is a statute of limitations.

MR. MacLEOD: And this is the legislation given by the House.

" (16) - (1) There shall be a commission to be known as The Ontario Forest Resources Commission consisting of a chairman and not more than four other members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

" (16 - (2) The Commission may,

(a) carry on research work, studies and investigations having for their objects,

(i) the conservation, development and beneficial utilization of the forest lands of Ontario, and

(ii) the improvement of methods of planting, developing, utilizing and marketing forest trees upon Crown lands and the lands of lessees, licensees and concessionaires of the Crown;

(b) exercise such powers and perform such duties as may be vested in or imposed upon it by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; and

(c) generally do such things as it deems necessary or advisable to protect and utilize to the best advantage the forest resources of Ontario.

" (16) - (3) The salaries and expenses of The Ontario Forest Resources Commission shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund."

That is the end of the quotation from the Bill which was placed before us. If my memory serves me right, the then hon. Leader of the Opposition who is now also the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) gave the approval of his party to the establishment of this commission.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is right.

MR. MacLEOD: And he spoke on it at great length. I believe the Liberal party spoke on it, and of course not to be left outside, we gave it our benediction and we asked that a Labour man be put on the commission and we were given the assurance that he wou d be a genuine labour man. That happened in 1944.

Here we are in 1950. The question I want to put is this: was the party, of which the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) is a member, serious when it promised the people of Ontario that there would be a Forest Resources Commission. Was the Speech from the Throne in February, 1944, which favoured the introduction of such legislation, taken seriously, and did this House take seriously a decision which placed the Assembly on record as being in favour of a piece of government legislation, or are the things we do here simply to be looked upon as "window dressing" by a government that knows it is going to the people and intends to put it in a most favourable light, and having been returned to office, does not have the courage or the decency to come before the House and explain why it abandoned the policy that the House approved, and provides the legislation to bring it into effect.

I am speaking at length on this because I know that many organizations in north western Ontario have again, and again and again, asked the government to implement the legis-

lation passed in 1944 and they have made that request to the government quite apart from the campaign which some people feel is a propoganda campaign to serve the interests of certain iddividuals.

The hon. minister (Mr. Scott) knows that the Ontario section of the Trades and Labour Council were submitting a brief to the government a couple of weeks ago asking for the establishment of this commission, and they asked for that on many occasions.

The unions concerned in this industry have asked for the appointment of a commission, and I think we are all agreed that the argument in favour of establishing such a body was advanced in the House with such telling force by the former hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) that there is nothing else we can do to it. He made a very marvellous case, and I think everything he said in 1944 stands for 1950. I think the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) who is being harassed by these people from north western Ontario, if he stated such and such, he might escape some of the anguish of his office. He would escape some anguish if he said that his appointment was more than he could bear and that he was in favour of setting up this commission. It will relieve him of these onerous responsibilities.

In closing, it must be said that the Department of Lands and Forests, generally, has received much attention in this House, and it has received the attention of a very able man who was appointed as a Royal Commissioner to look into that side of our economy, and made representations and indictments, and I think it is time that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), whom we all hold in high regard and respect, should take a half hour or three quarters of an hour

to enunciate to this House the 1950 policy of the Department of Lands and Forests, and what connection there is between the 1950 policy and the policy enunciated in 1943 and approved by the House in 1944.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) going to speak? If not, I will.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): What was the question?

MR. MacLEOD: Did you not catch the question?

MR. SCOTT: I just wanted to give you a chance to speak.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to give you a chance to speak. You were an hon. member of the government that promised to establish a Forest Commission in Ontario, and you were an hon. member of the government that introduced Legislation that gave approval for the establishment of such a commission, and what I want to know, and I think the other hon. members want to know, is why has the government turned its back on the pledge made in 1944 and the legislation that it introduced in 1944, and why it is repudiating those oratorical speeches that Mr. Drew made in 1944 and 1945? Is that a good question?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Does the hon. member for York South (Mr. Jolliffe) wish to supplement the question?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. I would like to hear the hon. minister (Mr. Scott).

MR. SCOTT: The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) said that this enunciation of a forest commission was in 1944 on the basis of which the government of the day won an election. There have been two elections since then, and the whole set-up of the House has changed. It cannot be said that one single election was won when two others were won since. It cannot be said that the whole election depended on that announcement, when there have been two other elections

won since.

The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) must remember that at that time I was not sitting in my present capacity, and possibly when the government came in, in 1944, there was a necessity for a commission which today might not exist to such an extent.

The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned that he was responsible for the suggestion that a Labour man should be on this commission. I think your group should feel honoured that a man who has always been a Labour man is now head of the department.

MR. MacLEOD: Would you name that man?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Myself. In this speech which you have quoted from, if I remember, various practices were established, and I think the hon. members both of the governemt and the Opposition will admit that forestry has made great advances in the past five or six years. Take your fire protection and forest management and the inventory. In connection with the Lakehead inventory, that is necessary for proper forest management. You cannot manage your business until you know what is in stock, and with the proper inventory comes forest management. Management means the end of high-grading and each operator must submit to the department a working plan of the area allocated to him. It is to ensure a continued good forest. Would the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) dispute that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think it is as easy as that.

MR. MacLEOD: From what the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) has just said there would seem to be no alternative but to conclude that present government of Ontario has no policy at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would find it difficult to conclude there is no policy, but as far as the House is concerned, this House has been tongue-tied about the policy, if there is one.

One of the great weaknesses is that a great deal of time has been spent discussing relatively unimportant matters, and very little discussion upon such important matters as the most valuable resources of this province. I would have thought that at a time six years after the Legislature discussed this to establish a commission, and three years after the committee report, that the government would be ready with a policy that would make sense to the House. We have all been subjected to a flock of arguemtns or propoganda from the Head of the Lakes about one phase of management in north western Ontario.

There has been no clear statement from the government as to the policy with respect to that matter, and I think we should be told more about.it. We have a department administering 85 per cent of the land of the province, and responsible not only for wood but for other resources,and apart from some of the legislation passed in former years, we have never had a statement of policy. We have never had any statement about the government attitude towards the Kennedy Report, except the statement that it is being given constant consideration, and statement that you are doing what you can about it and other generalties,which will certainly not bear examination. I would like to hear from the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) what he has to say after three years' consideration about some of the suggestions in the Kennedy Report in regard to the situition in the north.

This was a large and comprehensive report, and I will not go into it in detail, but we can single out one or two things. With reference to saw logs at the Head of the Lakes

Mr. Kennedy said this at page 178 of his report, and whatever we think of the legislation we have been receiving, this statement seems to be clear.

He said in his conclusion, leading up to the solution of the problem:

> " I am convinced that unless vigorous remedial measures are soon taken, the lumber industry will continue to diminish in importance to such an extent that before twenty-five years it will be classed as a minor industry, which would be a major tragedy. If this should happen, it will very severely affect every farmer, home-builder, mine, railway or industrial enterprise which uses lumber ot timber. A high mortality rate amongst secondary industries dependent upon sawmills may also be anticipated."

That is a clear statement coming from a high authority, and a very serious statement, and what is the attitude of the government with respect to a statement like that? We have not been told.

And again, in paragraph nine of his conclusions leading to the solution of the proboems, Mr. Kennedy said this:

> " There is a widespread feeling that some individual operators have been favoured more than others and that departmental action has been slatned to the benefit of some groups. The text of Chapters IX and XV give substance to complaints on this score."

If that condition known in 1947 has been corrected, then will the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) tell us about it? He will get a good hearing. We know that some of the work done has been excellent, but on long-ragne matters we never

get anything that means anything. It was in chapter 21 of the report that Mr. Kennedy recommended the establishment of Forest operating companies. That was perhaps a radical proposal but it was very carefully considered by Mr. Kennedy who put forward some factual reasons.

Have we ever had a clear statement about this? They have not told us if they are for or against it. We must conclude that it was not feasible. What are the reasons and why was it not supported, and if Mr. Kennedy's reasoning was fallacious, where has he gone wrong? Mr. Kennedy said this in his report at page 188 in support of his recommendations:

> " When cutting starts, the needs of each type of industry would be integrated to the operation of each section of the forests. Materials suitable for poles and ties, sufficient to meet the needs, would be cut into suitable lengths for thqt purpose. Only straight logs in the larger sizes wou would be allotted to sawmills. The vexed question of the definition of a sawlog would be solved. It is my belief that nothing under 10 inches small-end diameter need be diverted to saw-mills in order to maintain present production. However, if that estimate should prove inadequate to meet needs, the minimum diameter could be dropped to nine inches. If it gave indication of providing an excess over the needs for sawlogs in any area, the diamgter could be raised to 11 inches. The situation would thus be always under complete control.
>
> " Jack pine could be diverted to kraft mills and to sawmills. Spruce, balsam and jack pine

> could go to the pulp and paper mills in the proportions which they can utilize. Poplar would go to soda-pulp mills, groundwood mills and sawmills, and so on."

He was suggesting that the companies would put an end to the dispute between the consumers about how wide they are permitted to cut, because that would be looked after and supplied by the forest operating companies that would have a monopoly in cutting in their area.

Maybe Mr. Kennedy was wrong, and although we thought it sound, apparently the government thinks he was wrong. Why were we not told. We were never given a clear statement in that regard.

I have received a very interesting publication about forest-spraying and D.D.T.; it is technical but it shows what is being done. We get that kind of information, but we get no information of fundamental policy such as I have just referred to. I could mention other examples, but at the moment I will content myself to the forest operating companies.

If that suggestion had been adopted, we might not have a dispute today between differant types of customers in the north country. It had not been done, and we do not know the reason. I know a big area is under administration by the department, possibly not yet of Dominion status; but it has a large jursidiction and it makes it more important that we should know the policy. These matters are of particular importance to a legislature when you are operating on an imperial scale.

When the British Parliament took a stand on the East India Company and some other adventurers there was a tremendous row. If this Legislature loses track of what is going on

in the north, the row might be of record proportions, and in the administration of this empire you should keep the Legislature informed about your policy, if there is a policy. There may be a policy, but is it a secret.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): As regards this operating company, better put it this way: The government feels that the principle of assigning various products to the mills which can utilize these products is very sound. When our forest industry is within a couple of years of reaching its finish the advisability of scrambling 12 to 15 fifteen lines to embark on a new proposition will be considered.

The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) suggested that if this company had been set up, we would not have had this problem at the lake head. I might point out that we have this type of operation going on at Fort Frances, and other places. We have the same type of operations in Kenora and the Dryden Pulp & Paper Company and others, where the sawlog operators and the pulp companies are exchanging products that are more suitable for the other mill.

(Take F follows)

In this particular area -- and I am sure the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) will bear me out -- it has been to a certain extent that of personalities. As I mentioned yesterday, in the past it has been a case -- during the war years especially -- the pulp companies being instructed to divert so many pieces of saw-log size, and then it became an argument on the price. So it is not a case of government policy that has caused this Lakehead dispute. Again, Mr. Chairman, I feel that an attempt to set up this operating company in this area, or any area, at the present time, until we have been able to study the reports of the forest resources survey, which is going on at the present time, and which will be completed inanother couple of years -- any action on our part would seem rather hasty, to start to scramble up an existing set-up, however faulty and creaky in its joints the operation might be, until we know what we have to work with, to set up a new procedure.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does not the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) think that a system which can be broken down because of the clashing of personalities is a pretty weak system? Must we depend in this connection on getting Earl Rowe, and Mr. Johnston to co-operate? That is not a good thing.

MR. SCOTT: This is one case, where we have a pulp company and a saw-mill company on adjoining limits, and it has fallen down.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then let me ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) this question; is he not aware that most of the hon. members of this House -- if not all the hon. members of the House -- have seen puny little sticks going into sawmills, and good-sized logs going into the pulp mills? Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) satisfied with the degree of co-operation, when that case is a fact, and we all know it is going on.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): To just what location are you referring?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. members of this House know what I am talking about, because we have all seen it in different sections of northern Ontario.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): When you look at the dumps of pulpwood at the mills, you must bear in mind that a portion of that comes in by rail, and naturally you see these big chunks there, but they have come in by rail, and I am sure the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) will agree with me that it is practically impossible for a sawmill to operate on rail-drawn wood and get out on today's markets. So we see log material that is being used in the pulpmills, but because one sees the odd large log there, it does not necessarily mean that it is being put to a use which is not the best economic use.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, following up what the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott Peterborough) has said, I think it should be pointed out that these difficulties of which the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) spoke a moment ago were seriously taken into account by Mr. Drew when he spoke in this House in 1944. I have only read a couple of paragraphs from that speech, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) that he might very profitably turn to volume 1, pages 152 to 156, and see for himself the very thorough grasp which Mr. Drew had of the forest program in this province, and the necessity for a proper policy, away back in 1944.

As a matter of fact, I was rather startled in reading this speech of his a couple of weeks ago, and turning then to the Kennedy Report, to find that four or five solid paragraphs of the introduction to the Kennedy Report were listed almost holus bolus from this speech which Mr. Drew made in this Legislature in 1944.

In the prospectus of the Conservative party, which was issued to people, in which the Twenty-Two Points were listed, there was a postscript or a foot-note, pointing out that every one of these Twenty-Two Points was based upon a careful examination of the facts.

There was absolutely no doubt in the minds of the government during that period that this proposal for the setting up of this Ontario Forest Research Commission was a sound proposition. I think it was a sound proposition, and I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) that a commission should have been set up, and one of its very first assignments should have been the taking of this forest inventory, of which the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) speaks. That would have been an essential part of its work. It would have been an excellent body to deal with the problems which exist at the Head of the Lakes just now, the controversy between the Great Lakes Lumber Company and the Great Lakes Paper Company, which has that whole community churned up, with thousands of people fearful and apprehensive of what is going to happen to their jobs.

If you had a commission of the type described in this legislation, I think they would be able to do a much better job on that than you are able to do yourself, for the simple reason that the people who are stirring up the community over this situation are leading members of your own party. The crusade in defence of the Great Lakes Lumber Company of today is being led by leading members of the Progressive Conservative party of Ontario.

Look at the confusion which is being created in the public mind. I do think that the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott, Peterborough) should say now either that he feels the proposition to set up this Forest Research Commission was sound, and

is sound, or he should say that the government has reconsidered the matter, and now believes it was "talking through its hat" when the proposition was advanced in 1944.

There is one other thing I wish to say. Until the government says that, I suggest we will have placed before you for a long time to come very strong demands for the implementation of legislation which is now on the Statute Books of this province, but which has never been implemented by the government.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr.Chairman, now that we seem to be going all over the lot, and not covering the items at all --

MR. MacLEOD: It is a big lot.

MR. COX: I thought I might as well put in my "two bits' worth," too.

I was somewhat gratified that so much interest is being taken in the Head of the Lakes, and particularly the constituency of Fort William, which I have the honour to represent, and I presume it is to other hon. members of this House. I was particularly interested to know that in the community where I used to live, the ministerial association has taken some interest in the affairs of Fort William.

MR. MacLEOD: The Lord is on your side, too.

MR. COX: If He were, He would correct a lot of these timber deals.

This is not the first time I have spoken on timber. I have been in this House some years. When I was here ten or fifteen years ago, I spoke alone; for many years I have been speaking alone. I have been like John the Baptist, crying in the wilderness. Now, everybody seems to be interested in the timber business. It is an important subject, and I am glad that everybody is interested in it, in this House today.

From my personal observations, and from many years of practical experience, and being interested in the timber of northern Ontario now, I will say that if you are sitting in this House two or three decades hence, you will not be quarrelling about the timber resources, because if the timber policy is not corrected, and the indiscriminate cutting is not stopped, and the fires continue to take their toll, just as sure as the sun rises in the East, this great area will be as bare as the Sahara Desert. That statement does not emanate from me alone. These views of mine are shared by many people who have a long and continuing experience in the timber business. Whether you like to accept that or not, that is the fact. That is what is going to happen, as sure as we are sitting here today.

It is important for many reasons, that something is being done. To a very great extent our national economy depends on the preservation of our natural resources, and particularly timber. I pointed out the other day that to a very great extent much of the dominion revenue comes from the development of these resources, and particularly from nowsprint.

(Page F-6 follows)

I was interested in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said about some rather significant statements in the Kennedy Report. I can only speak from memory; he was reading the report. I think he said something about the observations of Mr. Kennedy, to the effect that "obviously some of the situations were slanted to favour certain individuals". I have no doubt that is true. I remember there is a statement credited to Mr. Kennedy in that report, where he said, "In the securing of these limits for export, and in the conditions of sale, it is the intention to build mills, and those intentions were never intended to be carried out, but were simply a pawn in the game of securing Ontario timber land for export."

I am speaking there only from memory, but I think it was in words to that effect. I may not have related it word for word, but that is the effect of what Mr. Kennedy said, and I am sure he was right, when he made that statement.

There is much to be said about having an independent tribunal to handle these resources. I could conceive of nothing better for the province of Ontario than to find a practical, experienced, administrative body, which could handle this great resource. If that could be, or is done, I am sure the beneficial effect will be beyond comprehension. There is no use "kidding" ourselves about how these resources have been handled in the past; no use trying to fool anybody about that. There is no doubt in my mind that personal and political gain have been the main motives in securing these huge areas over the last twenty years. There is no use trying to fool anybody about that. I have a resolution recommending that a committee of the hon. members of this House, -- and they are the ones who should be on a committee, -- in my opinion -- come up to the north country. I hope my suggestion is accepted.

I know that if a committee is appointed, and comes up to the north, they will learn what I am speaking about now. I have been over 25 years in this business, and if they will come to the north and study the conditions, and learn something about what has been done, I am satisfied that they will come back to this House with a report that would be a revelation. If you will appoint such a committee, and I cannot satisfy them with regard to what I say, that the effects of the reports they make and the effect of the information they would be able to secure, would be astounding -- if I cannot do that, I will not bother coming back to this House again.

MR. MacLEOD: You do not think there was any favouritism when the Liberals were in power?

MR. COX: I am not talking about the Liberals. I am talking about the general policy. I think some of the Liberals stand out above the Conservatives, in regard to that timber, like the Statue of Liberty. You could put some of these deals out before the public, like the Athabaska deal, the Beauharnois deal, and the Whitney deal, and they would look like an afternoon tea-party. I know what I am talking about. These things have not been handled in the proper way. Do not "kid" yourselves that they have.

MR. MacLEOD: Beginning when?

MR. COX: Perhaps before I was born. It rather irks me, when questioning the policy on export wood -- and I am a timber man myself; I may have some faults, but I would not gull the public of Ontario into entering into any arrangment for the exploitation of this great natural resource, and when I read the Kennedy Report, where it said that these were simply a pawn to secure this timber for export, I think he is correct.

This probably will not be the last I will have to say on this subject, as I expect to be here at least a couple of years more.

Let me repeat that the economy of Canada, the welfare of Canada, and to a very large extent the welfare of northern Ontario depends upon the way we handle this great natural resource.

I am only repeating what I have said when I say that unless there is some correction in the handling of this in 20, in 30 or 40 years at the most, that natural resource will be gone.

The power dams will be ineffective, the trees and timber will all be gone, and the whole area will be nothing but an area of waste.

I have not been too particularly interested, nor taken any particular part in the controversy between the two great bodies at the Head of the Lakes. I agree altogether with what the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) has said concerning some personal elements which entered into it, as I find lots of people making suggestions, who do not know what they are talking about. I think this problem should be considered. I think I said yesterday that the Department, in that regard should not be too unduly criticized for what they are doing.

Speaking again to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, and having regard to what Mr. Kennedy said -- the most significant statements indicating there is something radically wrong, -- I think there is some substance in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, and what Mr. Kennedy said at that time. It does seem strange to me that a committee is appointed by the government, and paid by the government, at a cost of three or four thousand dollars, and then they appoint a commission and spend several hundreds of thousands of dollars on that commission, and when they make certain recommendations, as far as I know, none of those recommendations have yet been carried out.

So Mr.Chairman, perhaps I have prolonged the debate, but when everybody else was running all over the table, I thought I would say a few words. I would like permission to discuss item by item, when we get to them, in detail. On item 108.

MR. COX: I was going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) about that item at Lac Seul. I see a recapitulatuon of that, $186,000. for aerial surveys, ground surveys, and the Lac Seul storage dam, control and maintenance. What part did the province of Ontario play in that development?

I think I am safe in making this statement that there is somewhere between 500 and 1,000 miles of shore-line flooded. The loss has been colossal. I am wondering what part the province is taking in adding to the continuing costs. I think there has been enough timber wasted there by the flooding of this area to run a very large pulp mill for many, many years, and those trees will be there, as a menace to navigation for another 50 years.

I was wondering what part the Departmenttook in the plan, because, goodness knows, they lost enough money already.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): That $3,000. consists of $1,000. paid to each of the provincial representatives on the Board, that is Mr. Fullerton, and Dr. Hogg, I think it is, and $1,000. expenses, and the federal government refunds that to us. It is really a bookkeeping entry.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, just one short question. In the case of the inventory and the survey; are they being carried out by the department, or is it being done by private enterprise?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): The aerial survey is carried out by the Department. This inventory has been carried on

so far, by contract. It is being cut down pretty well, and the Department let contracts to an outside firm, for part of it.

Vote 103 agreed to.

On Vote 108.

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, this vote is in connection with the Forest Research Branch, and I see an item there of $210,000. allotted to them for their work during the year.

I think we lose sight of the fact that great areas of our northern resources are Jack Pine; we lose sight of the fact that a lot of these quarrels going on are over Spruce. Our forests in the north country -- taking the whole area by and large -- actually consists of a good percentage of Jack Pine, which to the people up north and the lumbermen generally, are regarded as "weed trees"

(Page F-11 follows)

Down in the southern states, the slash pine -- which is comparable to our Jack Pine, although the Jack Pine grows much larger -- in two places they are turning out enormous quantities of newsprint. I would like to see that item of $210,000.increased to $2,100,000., with an expansive program of research by the department, perhaps through the research foundation, so that a complete utilization of Jack Pine could be effected, not just for the craft paper or the craft pulp, but ultimately for newsprint, that is, a greater utilization by the newsprint people of Jack Pine.

I will read quite briefly from an article reporting an address by Don Scart of the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company Limited, in an address to the Kenora Rotary Club, at one of their luncheons, in which he said that the estimate of Spruce and Balsam was 25 percent., Jack Pine 49 percent., and Poplar 23 percent. He pointed out the Kenora mill now uses spruce, Jack Pine and Balsam.

I have here some samples of various papers. Here (indicating) is a fine grade of paper, as fine as you can get. The engineers tell me that is comparable to any made now from regular Spruce sulphite. That was made by a sulphite process with 35 percent. Poplar, 30 percent Aspen, with a sulphite process, and 35 percent. Spruce sulphite, and it is as good as any made from an 80 percent. Spruce product.

There is something our research people could look into, and if it was done through a recognized agency, I think we would find a greater utilization for such newsprint.

There (indicating) is a fine crepe paper, 30 percent. Spruce and Poplar, 30 percent. Spruce Sulphite, and 30 percent. Aspen.

Here (indicating) is a newsprint made from 37½ percent. Aspen, 37½ percent. Poplar groundwood, and 37½ percent.

Spruce groundwood. There is good utilization.

There is one with 75 percent. Poplar groundwood, and 25 percent. Aspen.

These papers were made in a laboratory, and it is entirely possible to make them. The engineers tell me it is a little more costly to make, perhaps $10. or $15. per ton more than the ordinary newsprint using a Spruce groundwood and sulphite.

As a matter of fact, the clipping from which I read is printed on newsprint produced by the Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company, of which 40 percent. is groundwood. other than Spruce.

If we have the "weed trees", which amount to 40 percent., the efforts of the Research Council, or some comparable body, probably would enable us to find further utilization of that wood.

I think that item of $210,000. could well be increased to $2,100,000., and then I hardly think we would have enough money in the final analysis, to achieve this aim, namely, the utilization of all species, for the various products being manufactured by the pulpmills in this province.

(Page F-13 follows)

MR. JOLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, before we go any farther, would the hon. minister (Mr. Scott), tell me in which vote the expenditures on nurseries are to be found? I have been through these estimates, and as far as the estimates are concerned, we would not know there were any nurseries . Will the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) indicate where they are hidden away.

MR. SCOTT: Vote 109.

MR. JOLIFFE: "Basic organizations". Now, under what item, in vote 109, will they be found.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): It is pretty well through all these items.

MR. JOLIFFE: I think the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) will appreciate, that if he were sitting in opposition, he would not think that was a very good way of presenting the estimates. I think, he would be rather indignant about it. These nurseries are important. They are doing a wonderful job. If the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) can tell us how much production has been increased in recent years, I would be glad to have that information. I am not addressing myself to the merits or demerits of the nurseries, but I suggest they should be identified in these estimates. He will agree with me, I am sure, that if he were sitting on this side of the House he probably would be rather peeved about the situation.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Yes, I appreciate that.

Vote 108 agreed to.

On vote 109.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls) Mr. Chairman, under 109, I want to pay my respects to the officers of the Fish and Wild Life Division, who are enforcing the law. I think they are doing a very fine job, and the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) has employed some very fine men in that respect.

Has the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) thought of increasing the pay of these men, for the trouble they take, for the criticism they receive, and for the work in general which they are doing.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): We did give consideration to that problem mentioned by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). At the present time, owing to the co-operation with Ottawa, on the trap-line surveys, and dealing with the Indians, which we have pending now, it will require twenty-one men, for which we are advertising, and which will be paid at a still higher standard than the present service permits.

As regards the other point; we are giving serious study to the problem of salaries.

As regards the remark by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and his question; the nurseries are spread through the twenty-one district votes, each one having a certain appropriation for their own district works.

In this vote, No. 109, we vote that down, and we cover several organizations, fish and wild life, lands and forests, timber, reforestation, and air service.

Did I understand the hon. leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Jolliffe) to ask about the nursery growth? A year ago we brought it up to where it was 13,000,000 trees went out. This year we will have distributed approximately between 17,000,000 and 18,000,000 trees. This coming season we trust it will work up to around 30,000,000 trees. At present with the addition of the Kemptville and the Fort William nurseries, we have an estimated potential capacity of 50,000,000 trees.

MR. JOLLIFFE: By 1952?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Weather conditions have a lot to do with it, but I think by 1952 we should have that capacity. We have had great trouble in the last couple of years in expanding our nurseries. First, there was the problem of getting labour, then the desire to become mechanized. Then, for a proper nursery management, we must have a water supply, and we were up against the problem of getting water pipe. In the Orono setup, we were using transite, and I think we will be using it at Kemptville.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Water is very necessary.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it is important, so that we may know what is involved in these nurseries.

It has been suggested there should be a very great expansion in nursery production. The figures the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) has given us are very interesting. I think the House should be informed of the cost of maintenance of these nurseries. That information may not be immediately available, but I think we should know just what the cost is

for producing and developing, say, 30,000,000 trees. I believe that is in prospect. What was the cost last year for producing and developing 13,000,000 trees? Both the total cost and the cost per unit would be interesting to me.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I will be glad to get that for the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. COX (Fort William): May I say a word about the nurseries, Mr. Chairman? There is one at the head of the Lakes, and it would appear the Department is entitled to some credit for establishing that nursery. I might ask the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough)-- perhaps there is no answer available at once--. Is it the intention eventually to re-plant some of the trees? There is no way of determining how many trees are cut, and I am only hazarding a guess, but I would say in that district there are between 20,000,000 and 40,000,000 trees cut each year. And there are none going back. If there are any, it is so inconsequential, that it is hardly worth noting.

That may be a difficult question to answer. Is it the intention some time to use these nurseries, as a means of reforestation, to increase the number of trees which are constantly being depleted?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): The intention is to replace, where natural regenistation is not taking place.

MR. COX: I think it is obviously a fact that once you cut out a spruce swamp, the spruce does not come back.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It depends on the locality.

TAKE "G" FOLLOWS.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, this item is one on which every section of the House asks for more money rather than less to be spent. That is very encouraging, and indicates an increasing awareness on the part of the people in the province of the failure up until now to reproduce forests as rapidly as they are being depleted. I want on this occasion to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) the position taken by the men who are employed in the lumber industry, the workers, the woodcutters. I have in my hand a clipping from the Port Arthur News Chronicle of February 14, 1950. This union, which represents all of the bush-workers of Ontario asked for a $1,000,000. program to reforest the areas that have been depleted, as well as other areas. I understand it is a ten-year program which is proposed. While there are differences of opinion as to where the money for this work should come from, some thinking it should come in larger amounts from the industry that is exploiting the natural resources, who cut the forests, and make hundreds of millions of dollars in profit though they may not agree to the extent to which they should be taxed or charged, all agree that it is necessary to expand the reforestation program far beyond that which has been done until now.

In this decision of the union, arrived at at the conference, they expressed great alarm at the rate of depletion which is taking place and plead with the government, evidently, that this large-scale program be undertaken without delay and emphasize the fact that the large number of unemployed in the province would provide the necessary labour for this great

project and that, aside from solving somewhat the immediate unemployment situation, it would place the province on the right track insofar as reforestation is concerned. Therefore, the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is in the very fortunate position where everyone is critical not because he spends too much but because he does not spend enough, and I think he should battle in the Cabinet for a policy that will provide him funds from any source obtainable especially by increasing the timber dues and other charges that even -- I should not say "even" -- the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) who is himself a fair-sized operator suggested, and that the money be made available to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) and his Department to undertake a real, gran , sweeping reforestation program that will meet the requirements of that basic industry.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) are trees available from the Fort William nursery to farmers in northwestern Ontario who want to establish woodlots or to make other use of them for planting? Then I would also like to know if he has given any thought to assisting farmers in establishing woodlots on their farms. On one or two other occasions I have mentioned in the House that I thought it would be good policy to help farmers to establish woodlots on their farm which would eventually over a period of years produce another crop on each of those farms.

I think on more than one occasion I have mentioned that I thought it would be good policy to have a forester in those areas. I believe they are on the same basis as our agricultural representatives.

I would just like to know if the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) has given any further thought to this matter.

MR. SCOTT: (Peterborough): Mr. Chairman, first I might say that was the idea of establishing the Fort William nursery, because trees in the east are ready for lifting earlier than the soil is ready to receive them out there. For that reason, we felt it advisable to establish a nursery right in the area.

As regards the second proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Newman) I quite agree that it is desirable to have competent advice as to the suitable type of trees to be planted in the area, and I am sure you will find your district forester will be only too glad to co-operate with anybody who is desirous of starting a plantation. It would be my hope, following this most excellent vote of confidence in the administration of our Department and all its phases which was just moved by the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), that when we had more money -- or rather, let us put it this way, when we can get better mechanized equipment and have the better-trained staff, I would like to build up a force of trained men -- you see, the planting season is so short -- who would go with the mechanized equipment to your farm, shall we say, where they can do the work for $7. or $8. an acre as compared with $15. an acre, if you were doing it by hand; we would then know that our trees were bei g planted in the proper soil and in the proper manner. All that is still part of our policy.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Very glad to hear it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr.Chairman, before we get too far away from it, if the hon. member for Kenora (Mr.White) will permit, on the point raised by my hon. friend, the member for Fort William (Mr. Cox), that is to say the reforestation by artificial means in areas where natural regeneration is not sufficient, is that not the responsibility of the cutting company?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is that not the responsibility of the cutting company? I know there is one private nursery already; there may be more. Are there any cutting companies with private nurseries other than the one near Kapuskasing?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): To my memory there are three of them undertaking that. However, what the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) said is quite true, the Black Spruce very often does not come back to its true strength. You were not with our party, but our party was out to that nursery at "Kap" and it is largely Black Spruce they are preparing there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. COX: I talk too much, but there is an outstanding example -- I beg your pardon?

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): If the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) is going to speak on the subject under dis - cussion, it is quite all right.

MR. COX: Well, perhaps I am not.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: There was an oustanding example as to what returns when Spruce is cut. It is very vivid. Perhaps 50 or 75 years ago, long before the railroad, the old Hudson Bay Company in going north, coming up from the Lake, when I presume Indian labour was very cheap, cut a road 200 feet wide from Nipigon River to Lake Nipigon, right through the Spruce swamps. The demarcation is as visible as this wall. That wide road was cut, I can tell by the age of the Spruce, somewhere between 50 and 75 years ago, and there is not a thing on that road today but tag alders, inferior species of trees, but on both sides the Spruce that was there 50 years ago is still standing. So there is no question about it, when you cut a Spruce swamp and leave it in the natural state, Spruce does not come back naturally.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 109, "District Offices, including Provincial Parks"; all hon. members, I think, have been circularized regarding the Superior Peace Memorial Forest which particularly concerns the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman). I think all hon. members who have read through it are agreed that basically it is a sound idea, but it has a rather novel feature and that is that tourists' outfitting camps will be allowed in the area.

I would particularly ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough), in view of some of the letters I have had from my own riding that, when consideration or misconsideration is given to that proposal, the Department makes sure there is a sort of hard core within the centre where either very few or none at all in the way of tourist camps will be allowed. Perhaps, in agreement with the United States, a ten-mile circumference could be set up in which so many camps would be allowed. and then perhaps a 20-mile circumference could be set up in which an additional number of camps would be allowed, so there would be a sort of hard core of natural forests.

I see by the brochure here, that some very prominent citizens in this country are associated with the idea, that the people who have written to me are naturally concerned that the area should not be exploited, and that the essential details of working out the tourist outfitters' licensing in the area be very rigid so that they maintain the general idea that the people whose particular project it is are well looked after by the Department of Lands and Forests.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr.Chairman, I might say the remarks of the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. White) are right along the Department's line of thinking.

Votes 109 and 110 agreed to.

On Vote 111.

MR. COX: May I say a word about that? I want to emphasize

again from my own personal observation that it is all right to talk about nurseries and regeneration, but I think fire is our greatest hazard. One fire would wipe out in a few years all the trees that a lot of men would plant in ten years. With a recapitulation of all the figures you mention apparently the fire services of Ontario are costing $1,520,000. I am assuming the Air Force would be chargeable for fire protection.

Yesterday you did not disagree with me as to the possibility and perhaps practicability of trying to use helicopters, although you had some doubts or some apprehension as to their weight-carrying capacity. I happened to notice in this morning's Globe and Mail that they have now completed a helicopter of new design with a carrying capacity in all probability far beyond the requirements needed for a fire-fighting service.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would it carry the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott)?

MR. COX: Well, I hope so. He is certainly a corpulent chap.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Which hon. Minister?

MR. COX: Yes, which hon. Minister?

AN hon. MEMBER: Carry him straight up.

MR. COX: I do not think you disagreed with me that if helicopters were practical and would carry a sufficient load, they would be very useful, much more than planes or even canoes in getting at the seat of the fire shortly after it started. I rather think you agree, and if a helicopter could be constructed of sufficient size and carrying capacity -- and as I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) pointed out the other day, the province would have to spend millions to provide the necessary facilities and equipment to establish and go into the construction of helicopters; the dominion

has those facilities and should have an interest in these resources. Much of our national revenue, as I said, accrues from natural resources. It is not a very difficult task to find out if the dominion would not co-operate with the province, and perhaps allow the provincial department to utilize their equipment and personnel for this very important purpose.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): We have contacted the Dominion on this point, and find they have one helicopter at Trenton. That is all they have at present. I presume they feel as we do, that they are still in the experimental stage, but very possibly as an outcome of this new forestry Bill they brought in, and the Dominion-Provincial discussions which we will be having this fall, something may be worked out along the lines the hon. member (Mr.Cox) suggests.

MR. COX: I am still talking too much, but I pointed out to you yesterday that it is 12 or 14 years since I was lifted up, with many more people, at Miami, and taken from one hotel to another, and if memory serves me correctly, it is some years ago that they even picked up the hon. former Premier (Mr.Drew) in front of the building and carried him some place.

MR. MacLEOD: To Ottawa.

MR. COX: Yes, carried him to Ottawa. That indicates the practicability of helicopters.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr.Chairman, Where do we stand now with regard to steel towers, our old friend steel towers? Any improvement, any change?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): We awarded contracts last year for 50 steel towers scattered at strategic places across the province. The contracts were placed, I think, some in

Fort William with the steel company there, to supply that area, and others placed in eastern Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Have they been built yet?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Frankly, I do not know whether they have been erected or not. We had our crews out two years ago preparing the bases. The contracts went through the Department of Public Works, that is why I have not my finger closely on the situation. I could find out.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There would be still need for 50 more, would there not if Kennedy's advice were taken?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): As rapidly as we definitely survey the blind spots. You will understand the principle of one being able to overlook and cross the field of the other.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): When we locate further blind spots, we will continue to add to them.

Votes 111 and 112 agreed to.

On Vote 113.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): On 113, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a word on item 4, the Jack Miner Foundation, $1,500. I think it is probably agreed by all hon. members that the Jack Miner Foundation has probably been the greatest individual contribution to the preservation of wild life and has also carried on a continuous campaign of education on conservation. I think we are all agreed they are doing a very excellent job. At the same time, they are running into financial difficulties. I think hon. members of the House have received financial reports of the Foundation of recent date as well as the audited accounts, showing their financial position at the present time.

I fully believe the Foundation should be supported to a far greater extent than the $1,500. we have set out here.

I think in view of the fine work they are doing, the province should at least support it to the extent of about $5,000. a year, and probably considerably more from the federal authorities. I was hopeful this item in this year's Budget would be something like $5,000. rather than $1,500. that has been carried for some years past.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) if he will consider the matter of increasing this grant far more than is set out here.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): There is a little difficulty to it now, Mr.Chairman, but I shall be glad to bear in mind what the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) asks in this presentation.

Vote 113 agreed to.

On Vote 114.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. Minister (Mr.Scott) make his annual pronouncement on the wolf situation?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: We would like to hear the hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) annual pronouncement on the march of the wolves.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: When does it come?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): In 1949 we sepent $59,977. in wolf bounty; this year we estimate we are going to spend $65,000.

MR. JOLLIFFE: $75,000. You are $10,000. out, are you not?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): That is ending March 31st, 1950. We estimate we will have paid out $65,000. The increase in bounty on the wolf pups did not work out so well.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): But in all fairness it may have been that our legislation did not get to the trappers

on their areas in time. Last year the number of wolf pups turned in for bounty, in the period ending March 31st, 1949, was 84; this year, to January 7th, it was 41, and according to the tables we should not expect many more wolf pups between January 7th and the end of March.

MR. MacLEOD: A result of the depression.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): In looking over the years where bounty has been raised, it is rather peculiar that every time the bounty was raised, next year the take of wolves dropped, so I am hoping perhaps the take of wolf pups may be up next year to justify the increase in the bounty.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Just for my own information: How much is the bounty per wolf?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Adults, $25.; pups, $15.

MR. BROWN: Same for bear?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): No, I think bear is $10.

(Take H-1 follows)

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Would it not be possible to drop the bounty on the wolf pups and increase the bounty on the wolves? That would encourage the hunting of them by airplanes. The bounty on the wolf pup does not seem to have been a success, and I would suggest that the bounty be increased on the wolves.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I think possibly that the news about the baby bonus did not get around to the female wolves, and we will have to give them another year.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) find that he is paying enough bounty?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): On the southern limit we pay 40 percent. up to $25. Some counties have gone to $35., but we pay 40 percent.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There has been some killing and bounties claimed in the southern areas. A reeve not far from Toronto got a wolf on his farm, and in an area where there is poultry farming. Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) find wolves are on the increase in the southern area, or on the decrease?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I have not that break-down. In Peterborough, we have had over the past few years an increase of wolves in the area. They may be following the deer, because we have deer there that we did not have 50 years ago. It may be one following the other.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What do we pay in Toronto?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is high. They are all at the Royal York.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): In Niagara Falls, we have had four wolves shot in the last few weeks.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is that not for the Niagara Parks Commission?

Vote 114 agreed to.

On Vote 115.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): On that item of $75,000; we do a good deal of quibbling on the bounty and the killing of wolves. Maybe what I say will be rather critical, but the Department has spent an enormous amount of money on that plane service and to an ordinary business man it seems rather wasteful to see the big planes flying over. I do not think a business man would consider them. I am wondering if savings could not be effected in that particular Department. I think we should not be so niggardly as to spend a little money. We do not want to be penny wise and pound foolish. I think we could find plenty of businessmen who would pay you half a million dollars a year and I do not think many ordinary people would object to another $50,000.

I have only two questions, and maybe they should be for the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott). I was going to ask the total amount of revenue in the matter of dues, and the average rate for dues on export of wood, and if the charges were equal in relation to charges in other provinces, and adjoining states, and whether there was any speculation when conditions were so high during the war period.

And in the fire-salvage operations in regard to the resources destroyed last year, I notice a large item there, and I was going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) what they are doing in that logging operation and the salvage of fire-killed timbers.

Votes 115 and 116 agreed to.

MR. COX: Are those my answers?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I was waiting until we came to the fire salvage. On the others, I do not have that information, but would be glad to obtain it for the hon. member (Mr. Cox)

On the fire salvage, I do not think it is necessary to review the starting of the two fires in 1948. If the hon. member for Fort William(Mr. Cox) had been in these huge planes, which are of the most efficient type, and looked at the Mississauga Valley, it would have made his mouth water to get in there and cut. But when the flames were roaring, it would make your heart bleed. Before the fires were out, we started surveying, and had out operating chains and sent in ground crews to take analyses. I think I said all that last year.

We have waterered in the season of 1948 and 1949, 97 million feet. The first watering of the logs was on the tops that burned, and trees hard-hit and no sap was going up, and they would be subject to insect infection. The next year we went back and took the catch-basins. They were the ground fires and isolated parts which would not justify an operator going back in. With this season ending this March, we will have watered 66 million feet, and we estimate this coming year it will be about 20 to 25 million feet of these small patches which become useless every few years.

We estimate that we will sell somewhere in the neighbourhood of 250 million feet. We have set up a company at North Bay for the purpose of proper distribution to the markets of the products from the various mills which are sawing these logs here and there through the fire area. Rather than have these catch-basins on the market and some jobber go in at a cut price and cause a weakening, we felt it better that we put it through a central sales organization, and the Canadian Lumbermen's Association and the White Pine Territory Co-operative. The cutting will be done according to the White Pine's value standard, and there is a list of the recognized wholesalers who are active in the White Pine

market, looking after the sales from North Bay.

These companies, like J. J. MacFadden and the Blind River Company will start sawing the logs in the Mississauga, and it will be about 35 to 50 million feet. They are working with the government, and will sell it on the market in the regular fashion.

This year we had returned to us approximately $400,000. This coming season we will have around $5,000,000. unless something should happen to the market; if it were flooded from the excess production and cause the market to break. But when we salvage this, we may come out with a small profit. I do not like to look at this in the sense that we are making a profit. Whether we make a profit or not, we have saved and put at the disposal of the people of Ontario something which is irreplaceable today, virgin white pine, and at a profit or not, we will have done something concerning that.

(Page H-5 follows)

MR. JOLLIFFE: I agree with that, but certain individuals have made a profit. Certain individuals have made neormous profits.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Do I take it that the $4,900,000. was invested in this project?

MR. SCOTT: That is what we estimate we will require from the 1st of April to the 31st March next year for sawing and pulling.

MR. COX: This is something new. Is the Department in the business or financing the contract? You mentioned about 200 million feet. It depends where it is. 200 million feet is not worth more than $5 million in the bush. Is the department financing contractors or has it camps itself?

MR. SCOTT: We are financing the logs into the water.

MR. COX: Financing the contractors?

MR. SCOTT: Yes, and sawed into lumber and shipped by rail into North Bay as mill run where it is re-graded and air dried and dressed, and this is what it estimated it will cost to carry through this season's operation. That is on the basis of about $33. per thousand.

MR. COX: Where, to North Bay?

MR. SCOTT: That is f.o.b. cars, dressed and shipped out.

(Take I follows)

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Department conducted a thorough investigation into the Mississauga which was a particularly disastrous one. What was found to be the origin of that fire? It was in an inaccessible area, as I understand it.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Two causes, as near as I can find out. One was the burning of slash by a logging crew, and we have reason to believe that the other was a fire started by trappers who were poaching on that preserve, but we have not been able to pin it down to them as yet.

MR. COX: I am learning something today. I find that some of the operators have been subsidized. I seem to have lost out on that. I do not know where my friend, the hon. member of Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) was when this was being done. I was rather sleeping at the switch.

I heard the name of McFadden. I know him very well, and he is a very reputable operator, which perhaps is an exception among the lumbermen. I was going to ask if there are many contractors down there who are being financed in this manner, including Mr. McFadden? I hope you have not forgotten the other question I asked a few minutes ago. If you have the information, I think the hon. members might be interested in hearing it.

We have the expenses of the Department, for the last year, and I would ask if you have the revenue for last year. Are these contractors all being financed, or subsidized.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Of course, the hon member (Mr. Cox) will appreciate that the year has not ended yet,

and it will be practically impossible to give that information, before the close of the year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Up to this point, the expenditure has greatly exceeded the revenue.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): The expenditures, in connection with some of the operators, is a recoverable item, and it will be coming back.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wish you luck.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Could the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) inform the House of the revenue and expenditures for the last year for which there is a complete picture? I think it would be very interesting to know that.

MR. MacLEOD: A revenue of $10,000,000, is it not? It is the preceding year, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is asking about?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): It is estimated it will be $10,800,000 this year.

MR. OLIVER: Revenue?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Last year it was $11,410,352. That is for the year, ended in March 1949.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to ask a question which can be answered with a simple "yes" or "no".

On this McFadden business; am I correct when I assume that the Department has engaged the J. McFadden people to saw these logs.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Yes, on two developments. We will pay them, to saw them, pile them, and air-dry them.

MR. MacLEOD: Then the J. J. McFadden Company has the option of buying from you, the lumber which they saw.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I think we are selling them on a quick basis, such-and-such a percentage to each one of us, based on what the market price is.

MR. MacLEOD: They are paid for sawing the logs, and then they can buy them back from you?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): In the nature of an advance, for sawing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. minister (Mr. Scott, Peterborough) like to table these contracts.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): I can see no objection to it, nor anything to be gained by it.

MR. MacLEOD: Contracts are always interesting things to look at.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report progress. I may say, if I can, there is one bill I would like to clear up for obvious reasons.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; with Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report that the Committee has come to a certain resolution, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into the Committee as a whole.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Motion agreed to.

Motion Committee; Mr. Patrick in the chair.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we will be able to clear up this Bill before we notice that it is six o'clock, or not.

MR. JOLLIFF: Is this the origin of the expression "getting into a hole"?

MR. FROST: Well, I do not know. I am anxious to clear up the Hospital Tax Act, on account of the approach of the first of April, and I would like to make these reductions effective.

I will call Order No. 45.

THE HOSPITAL TAX ACT, 1948

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: "The Forty-fifth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 114, an Act to amend the Hospital Tax Act, 1948"

MR. FROST: I have a matter here which I am sure will please a number of the hon. members of the House, at least in connection with this Act. This Act as drawn in many ways just implements by way of legislation what has been the practice in the past, in connection with night clubs, dinner dances, and things of that sort, as I have explained before.

When we went into the question we found that ordinary dances which were conducted around the country and in cities, did not necessarily serve food. I have given a good deal of consideration to the matter of straight dances, which are conducted in dance halls, and places throughout the province.

There is a good deal of difference between a dance which is conducted, as a sort of a dinner dance which is sort of a place of entertainment, with food, with or without liquor, and an ordinary dance which is conducted merely with an orchestra.

In the first instance you have a place such as a cabaret or night club, which is very definitely a place of entertainment and amusement. It is true that the meal and the liquor which go with it, are all in the matter of the evenings entertainment. I will be quite frank in saying that in that class of thing, we have taxed them before on the basis of a 20% tax on a cover charge of $2.00 which, frankly, was not enough. In many of these places, in addition to dancing, they imported all sorts of things, circuses, and rodeos, and what not, and unquestionably they have not been paying a fair tax, in view of the fact that they are competing with others who are paying the tax.

On the otherhand, I recoghize with an ordinary dance there is an orchestra, but the entertainment they get is in the dance itself. They are not sitting there as they do at supper dances and cabarets, watching other people dance, and being entertained with a show and music--

MR. JOLLIFFE: They have to work for it.

MR. FROST: They have to work for it; that is right.

We are not taxing the bowling alleys. People go to bowl, they do their own entertaining, and their own work, and there is no tax there. There is no tax on golf clubs. People play golf, even though it may be a course operated for profit, many of these organizations do usually operate for profit, but

we are not taxing them. We are not taxing the billiard rooms. That is a form of entertainment, but there again the people take part in it themselves.

In the ordinary dances around the country, the same thing applies, and in looking back over our ruling and investigating the matter, we felt that an ordinary dance which took place, which was not connected with a night club, or did not have a night club type of entertainment should be exempt. We propose to do that.

All that I have said can be accomplished by striking out two words on page two, sub-section "G", and sub-section "I", by striking out, after the word "with" in the second line, the words "or without".

Mr. Chairman, when we come to that, I will move that the words "or without" be deleted.

This is a very complicated section apparently, but in operation it is fairly simple, and it is well understood by people in the business. It does not alter the basis of the tax which is applied.

What we are doing is this; in a place like a dining lounge or a dining room where food or liquor is served, we are not taxing where there is music which is provided by a musician or a group of musicians who operate together, such as an orchestra, with one entertainer. There is no tax under the present setup on that. We are not changing that position at all. But where they go beyond that, and where there is dancing, and where they go beyond the part prescribed in the Act-- and by the way, the Act simply translates into the Act the regulations under which we have been working,

both our government and the federal government as far back as 1941, and which are well understood.

The change in the situation is simply this; previously, in taxing these people-- perhaps I might go further back and say that in taxing these people, the federal government previously imposed a 25¢ tax of the total amount of the bill. If the bill was $20.00, then the tax would be $5.00; if it was $10,00, the tax would be $2.50. That was the federal method of taxation.

In 1948, we changed that and put in a tax based on an arbitrary cover charge of $2.00. We taxed them 20%, and the amount of the tax was 40¢ per cover, regardless of the amount of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, that obviously did not meet the situation. As I say, elaborate entertainments were being carried on where drink and meals were merely incidental to the entertainment. So we altered this by taking out the cover charge ruling of two years ago. If a person goes into one of these places, and incurs a bill of $1.00, we charge him 15¢, that is, a 15% tax. Then if the amount of the bill is run up to produce a tax of $1.00 that is the maximum. I think that is up to $6.67, or whatever the amount is, under this Act. That is the maximum, and we have felt it is a more just tax, and one which meets the situation more satisfactorily, and I must say in regard to the change in the basis of the tax, it has not brought up any objection so far. The fact is this form of tax is more fair and it provides for the proper tax, which is fair, as far as competing entertainments are concerned.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): On that point, may I ask the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) if it is not a fact that all the dance halls serve food.

MR. FROST: If, for instance, they serve coca cola, or sell sandwiches where there is self-service, it does not apply. The tax only applies where dancing is carried on, where the food is served by waiters at the tables. The purpose of the Act is to exempt all those places where there is self-service.

MR. MacLEOD: It applies only to commercial enterprises?

MR. FROST: No, the exemption goes farther than that. There are about six hundred dance halls in the province which are operated as commercial enterprises, but we recognize that the entertainment provided in those places consists of people going in and dancing themselves. The mere fact that they dance, is their entertainment. We exempt those, the same as we exempt the bowling alleys, and the billiard parlours. That seems a fair proposition.

But, when you get into places where meals are served-- and I am not talking about the chocolate bars-- or sandwiches, or hot dogs, or coca colas, or a cup of tea; they are all exempt-- but if you go into a place where you sit down at a table and food is served, then that comes under the taxing regulations.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Ladies' Aid Societies of this province who serve their guests at tables, very often, at the rural dances.

MR. FROST: Like Nelson with the blind eye at Copenhagan, was it?

MR. MILLARD: It is rather a flexible law.

MR. FROST: We have night clubs, cabarets, and that class of place , which run elaborate entertainments. If they want to run elaborate entertainments, they must pay the tax. If they do not run that elaborate class of entertainment, but merely run a dance with music, they do not pay the tax. I think the section is a reasonable section.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not entirely disagree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), but I doubt if his amendment accomplishes what he has in mind. Unless this flexibility is to be carried to the point where the officials of the Treasury Department are going to have complete discretion about who pays and who does not --

MR. FROST: No. This Act is much more inflexible than the other arrangement. The other arrangement was carried on by the federal authorities, firstly, and ourselves, secondly, starting under regulations. We are taking it out of the class of regulations, and putting it into the statute, where the situation is clearly set out, and is clearly understood, and is there for everyone to see.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is it clear? If the intention is to exempt the dances, of which thousands are held throughout the province, sponsored by all manner of organizations, then I would point out that I have not seen any of these dances yet without food. There is always the food there.

MR. FROST: I would say if the food is served to people at a table, then it comes into the night-club class. I think subsection (1.)of section one covers the point:

> "Service of food means the service of food or beverages -- "

-- there will be a little amendment to that --

"-- other than liquor, beer or wine to a purchaser at a table, in a place from which in order -- "

And I will strike out the words "to use facilities for dancing"--

"-- in order to view entertainment by one or more paid performers, or he is not required to pass through a doorway, or more than one doorway".

I think that limits it pretty well. There are many ways of evading this thing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Many dance halls in the country have only one room and a doorway, and to pass through that, leads them out into the road.

MR. FROST: I do not know of any country hall which serves meals. If they do, they have to pay the tax.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are losing the votes of the Ladies Aid Society. That is what you will do.

MR. FROST: I would never think of such a thing.

On Section 1.

MR. FROST: Mr.Chairman, I move that the words "or without" in the second line of G-1 be struck out.

Also I would like to move that the words in the fourth line of "L", "to use facilities for dancing or" be struck out. That will have the effect I have outlined.

Amendments agreed to.

Section 1 (as amended) agreed to.

Sections 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 114 (as amended) reported.

MR. FROST: I move that the Committee do now rise and report a certain Bill with amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the

Committee of the Whole House begs to report one Bill with amendment, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are you going to tell us what Estimates we may expect tonight.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, to gain time, I might move we go into Committee of Supply and we can start promptly at eight o'clock without any formalities.

I suggest we go ahead with the Department of Welfare and the Department of Planning and Development tonight, in that order.

If that is not satisfactory, perhaps I could make some other arrangement.

I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr.Patrick in the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: It being six o'clock, I now leave the Chair.

And at 6:13 of the clock p.m., the Chairman having called it six o'clock, the House took recess.

- - - -

At 8:00 p.m.

The Committee resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Page 88, the Department of Public Welfare, Vote 154.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, it would be timely to note that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Department of Public Welfare which was established in 1930. In a period of 20 years the province has paid from its own revenues $201,728,205.76. Great developments have taken place in the course of these 20 years but there is still considerable to accomplish.

While I am sure some hon. members of the House feel that we should go much further on the amounts being granted to our old-age pensioners, may I say that this government is sympathetic to our older citizens and we give every benefit of the doubt within the regulations.

I might observe that Ontario is not relying on a 3% sales tax to finance this program.

In the past two years I have made a determined effort to have the Department render better service to the individual cases coming within our jurisdiction.

We feel we have speeded the service considerably by eliminating the local boards and giving priority to the treatment of new applications.

The numbers of persons requiring assistance through the province has vastly increased and we find that now we are granting assistance directly to 130,000 persons including unemployable relief cases.

I am very concerned, as are a number of Members of this House, in the matter of assisting incapacitated persons who do not qualify for assistance on the basis of their handicaps. This problem is being considered at this time and presents many unusual difficulties. The varied types of disabilities presents a problem in itself and the method of certifying the cases is most difficult.

This Province is participating, along with the other provinces, with the Federal authorities this spring in reviewing the entire problem of aid to this disabled group, both by means of monetary assistance and rehabilitation. We are hopeful, that before the next Legislature meets, they will have some concrete proposal to make respecting the care of the incapacitated person.

This might take the form of a program sponsored by the Government of Ontario or one in partnership with the Federal authorities.

In Ontario we have the most generous Allowances and qualifications for Mother's Allowances cases and the upward trend in the number of recipients continues.

We are now also granting assistance to more borderline cases than ever before. The amendment which permitted the disabled husband to be included as a dependent is proving to be a progressive step.

We are not contemplating any new amendments to this Act at this time. The purpose behind this Act is to supplement the mothers and their families rather to encourage outright paternalism by means of total grants.

In the Child Welfare Branch we feel that the additional funds being granted to municipalities by the Province in the amount of 25% of the maintenance costs of wards and the 25% to

Children's Aid Societies based on their private contributions has been a very forward step.

It is interesting to note that this Government is now granting almost a million and a half dollars yearly toward the care of children incomparison to $13,000 for the year 1942-43.

I must say, however, that we are quite concerned in the upward trend in the number of wards and feel that more positive steps will have to be taken in the adoption of children than heretofore.

The problem of old age is the outstanding one facing all welfare departments throughout the country.

When this act came into force in 1929 only 34,066 qualified for this form of assistance. Today that number has increased to approximately 90,000. We can foresee substantial increases during the coming years.

I cannot agree that our present method of granting pensions is either sound or fair in principle, but it is the only method under which we can operate at this time because of the huge expenditures involved.

It would seem to me that ultimately this whole problem of the aged will have to be treated entirely by the Federal Government and by one of two methods - the first being a universal pension which would be granted to every citizen over 65 or 70 years of age with the Federal income tax provisions applying, the other a contributory scheme which would permit our aged to obtain a pension as a matter of right when reaching 65 or 70 years. It woes without saying, however, that a contributory scheme would be slow in becoming operative.

Payments would be difficult to collect and administrative costs would undoubtedly be high.

The present scheme would need to be maintained for a

number of years while contributions were being made by the population under the qualifying age. It would seem that under both the universal and contributory scheme, the Governments would be recognizing and - to some extent- subsidizing. The whole problem is further complicated by supplemental insurance and pension funds under private auspices.

I feel that the committee established by the Federal authorities should serve a very good purpose in consolidating the all-present available data relating to the care of the aged.

Meanwhile this Government will continue to give the most sympathetic treatment possible to all persons qualifying under the present Government of Canada Old Age Pension scheme.

In passing, I might say that over 75% of the total administrative problem of the Department is made up of Old Age and Blind pensioners. I must make some comment as to our program under the legislation passed last year, specifically the Homes for the Aged Acts.

From all accounts, the municipalities have accepted our proposal to meet 50% of the cost of new construction and maintenance, and a large percentage of the counties and cities are taking the necessary steps to improve the services, and many districts are contemplating new construction.

I would be less than human if I did not thank so many of the hon. members for their kind remarks made in this House in connection with our efforts to improve the lot of our less fortunate citizens.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I think we are all very happy at the statement made by the hon. minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow). At least, it is encouraging. I am glad he is in favour of elimination of the means test, and I think the whole House is. I am sorry we did not show it a little more positively because I did think before, and I still think it would strengthen the hand of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) when he goes to Ottawa in the fall.

I want to say at the beginning, and I do not intend to make a speech, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say I have found the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) very fair when you go to him with certain cases. He does a very excellent job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: However there are some points I think should be cleared and one that bothers a great many people is in regard to the property of old-age pensioners. I do not think there is any clear understanding of that, and I wish the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would clear it up. It has to do with the case of people who own a house who are old-age pensioners, and then they die, what happens to the house? Some people almost starve themselves rather than apply for old-age pensions because it is the old home, and they want to pass it on to their children, and there does not seem to be any clear understanding. I am asked about it all the time and I do not know quite what to say to the people and I hope the government will make it clear as we proceed.

I think, too, that much more could be done -- first, I want to say I think it is a very important department and it touches the people closely. I feel it is extremely important, the Department of Public Welfare. I think there is a lot of welfare that has not yet been covered, ut we are progressing in that direction the hon. Minister (Mr. Good-

fellow)mentioned, and I am glad he mentioned the totally disabled, or almost totally disabled. I think something has to be done about those people before very long. We have taken care of the blind, if they are blind enough -- this government has nothing to do with that, it is federal -- and about the aged, if they are old enough, but it is very old, 70. There are two or three years there that are difficult, from 65 on is difficult for some people and from 68 to 70 is difficult for a great many. I do not think it will be very many years before the age has to be lowered. That is coming. But it comes a little too slowly and a lot of people die in the meantime. All things that are progessing in this way go slowly. I do feel as the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) stated, that there could be a lot of children, but the adoption of children is too stringent. I happen to know, and I am sure other hon. members in this House know of cases where people with good homes, good people wanted to adopt children, and due to so many restrictions, and I never quite knew what, red tape and so on, they were not able to adopt children. These people had much to offer both as to character and to home, and would have made a good home for children and given them very good care, and yet they could not secure the children. Sometimes they wanted more than one child. I think something should be done about that.

I have a feeling, too, that it will not be very long in the future before the children of mothers on allowance become the responsibility for a longer period of time, of the government. I think it would help right now when there are more unemployed than we have had for several years. I think if those youths who are ill-prepared for the battle of life, were better prepared and a little older before they go on the Labour market, it would help all along, it would help

if they were cut off the market for another couple of years, and it would help those who are hunting for jobs. I want, when we come to it, to have a good many questions to ask about homes for the aged. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is willing to tell us about these homes, what type they are going to be; are they going to be large institutional buildings, or are they going to be cottage types, or what are they going to be? I think all that will come out better in questions than anything that could be said at this time.

(Page AA-8 follows)

I am very concerned about these homes for the aged. I see, over here on page 91, that 50% of the cost goes to the municipalities of maintenance of persons from unorganized territories. Half a million in new homes for the aged, $850,000. Well, if it is just going to be the kind of homes that the aged are living in, I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is a man of such good sense it is not going to be that kind. I want him to tell us about it so it will relieve our anxiety because I am sure there is not an hon. member in this House that thinks the County's homes for the aged are what they ought to be. If they are in any Counties, they are not in the Counties I am acquainted with. These homes are much too institutionalized and the people who are in them have not much liberty and they should not be called homes, whatever else they are called, they are not homes. These places are just buildings where people exist unhappily.

I do not think I want to say anything more but as we come to it item by item we can try to clear up these various things, particularly about homes for the aged, what the type is, what the plans of the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) and his department are and find out any plans regarding these various other things, some for adoption, easier adoption, supervised but sensibly supervised and so on.

Would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) care now before we go into it item by item to tell us something about the building program because this is a very large sum of money, a half million in one case and $850,000 in the other?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the question which the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) has asked in connection with our plans for homes for the aged, this is a matter which has given us a great deal of concern because as we all realize we have a large aging population and there is going to be an increasing need for proper accommodation for elderly people. People have only to travel through some of the wards in this city to realize the conditions in which we find many elderly people living. One of the first things we did, in the Act brought forward last year, was to do away with the word, the idea-- they had to be always more or less "committed" to a home. We have done away with that entirely. People go into homes today of their own free will and accord after having been passed by the medical doctor who examines those who are going into the home. We have done away with all commitments. That is something I never liked when I was down in my own county for a number of years in municipal life, I never felt it was proper that the reeve of municipalities should sign a commitment to commit someone to an institution. That may be alright for someone who has committed an offence and had to be committed to jail, that is different, but we have done away with that and people now go in of their own free will and accord.

I might say our conception of what these homes should be is that, in the first place, they do not want to be large institutions. I do not think, in regard to the size of the municipality that they should be built to accommodate more than two hundred people. The first thing we must have is

proper segregation. I am sure that most of us who have visited these homes appreciate how unfortunate it is that even old people who have made a contribution in their communities are all put in the common lot with those people in the communities who are perhaps mentally deficient and perhaps with the unfortunate old people who have become senile. This is undesirable. Also in the same wards you will find bedridden people and we think they should be segregated and that is what we have in our plans. The first one of these homes that will be built is in Sault Ste. Marie. It is expected the home will be opened this summer and I hope many hon. members of this House will avail themselves of the opportunity of visiting that home where you will see what we have in mind with respect to the proper segregation of these homes and I hope eventually it will be possible to build small cottages in connection with this home so that married couples would be able to live by themselves. At least, they may require some care, and they could get that care from the management of the home but it seems to me that they would have that necessary segregation which they should have.

I might say that a great deal of interest has been exhibited in this program from a number of counties and cities in the province who are now going forward with plans. I said a moment ago that the Algoma District is the first one that will have a home for the aged. Contracts have been let for a home for the County of Hastings who have entered into an agreement with the city of Belleville to supply a new home on

No. 2 Highway. That home will be going along this year and several other counties and cities have expressed sufficient interest that they have had plans drawn up by architects. I think it is a step in the right direction. I would say at this time, I hope none of the hon. members get the impression that we want all our elderly people to go into these so called institutions. I think there will always be a place for small, private homes for elderly people, but, these homes will be primarily used by the municipalities for people who have perhaps no friends or relatives of their own and who will require some type of care in their declining years.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, could the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) explain why he has discarded the welfare unit plan. It seemed a very good idea last year and it assisted the municipalities considerably in the welfare question. Could the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) give some explanation now?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, welfare units was a program which I sponsored in this House but I am sure the hon. members of this House will agree with me that in watching the trend over a period of years in connection with the administration and responsibilities for welfare services, the gradual trend has been towards a centralization or towards a higher level of governments taking a greater proportion in the cost of welfare services. That may or may not be desirable but yet you all know that a great deal of pressure is being constantly brought to bear on the higher levels of government for the provincial and federal governments to assume

a larger share of the cost of relieving the burden on the municipalities and with that in mind, we are not repealing the Welfare Units Act but we are just leaving it in abeyance for the present time because, as you know, there is a Dominion-Provincial conference to be held this fall at which no doubt the social security measures and welfare measures will be given a good deal of consideration. We feel it is advisable at the present time to not go forward and enter into any agreement with the municipalities in connection with welfare units until we know just where we are going and who is going to pay the cost of welfare services. As you know, over a period of years-- originally, our municipalities paid a share of the Mothers' Allowance costs and also the Old-Age Pension costs which werefinally assumed by the provincial government as far as the Mothers' Allowance was concerned, and by the federal and provincial governments as far as the Old-Age Pensions are concerned. That seems to have been the trend. We are still continuing the units in the districts of Northern Ontario but they are provincial units and it may be possible after giving this matter further consideration, it may be possible, in fact it may be necessary, to establish the provincial units for welfare administration.

MISS MACPHAIL: Before we get away from the homes for the aged, in the meantime, apart from the building that the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) mentioned in Sault Ste. Marie, what is to be done about old couples in the meantime before we get around to building cottages?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, provision is being made. They will be segregated, they will have a room of their own.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow), has any consideration been given to the type of apartment home or dwelling that has been erected in Burlington. Now, a number of citizens under the leadership of the federal member of parliament for Halton interested themselves in the federal housing scheme and erected the apartments there which I think ought to impress all of us. I have had the privilege of going through them and was greatly impressed with these apartments. They are self-contained apartments and provide a very comfortable, fair-priced home for these people, and in most cases they are able to find at least one couple that are able to act as caretakers for the other five or six apartments.

TAKE "BB" FOLLOWS.

I was just wondering, because the rentals are very, very reasonable, what attention had been given to erecting apartment buildings of that kind, for the elderly people? I would like to know what has been done.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Of course, Mr. Chairman, we have not given any consideration to that, because that is a private scheme, over there, I understand. As far as that is concerned, we are only going into the public institution angle of it. I do think it is a splendid idea.

MR. MILLARD: Could you not encourage it?

MR. GOODFELLOW: It is highly desirable that the elderly people remain in the communities where they have been living perhaps for a long time.

MR. MacLEOD: We seem to be discussing items listed in the summary, and I do not suppose it makes much difference just where I speak. If I speak now, I will not have to speak later on.

I would like to begin in joining the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) in expressing my appreciation to the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for the consideration he has given on all occasions, when I have brought matters to his attention, as they affect people in my own constituency. I have always found the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to be a man who was deeply interested in human beings. He is a man of kindly disposition --

MISS MACPHAIL: Is that so rare?

MR. MacLEOD: Well, do not press me for an answer. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and I were looking at him the other day, and sizing him up from this side, and we were observing how much he looked like Abraham Lincoln.

MISS MACPHAIL: He is better looking.

MR. MacLEOD: I suggest to the press they might go to the extreme a little bit, and by putting something on his chin, see how close he comes to the real person. But in the qualities of his heart he has much in common with that great man.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I say that quite sincerely. What I say of the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) I must also say for the officials of his department, including my good friend, the chairman of the old-age pensions commission, whom I see sitting in the shadows over there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: And because I represent a large constituency, I have had many occasions to approach Mr. Asbury for adjustments in the pensions, and paid to my constituents, and the service has been within the 24-hour period, and I cannot speak too warmly of the manner in which Mr. Asbury is carrying out his duties as chairman of that commission.

However, I have a criticism to make of the Department of Public Welfare, It takes them an awfully long time to answer a simple question. I have had a question on the Order Paper now for two or three weeks, and I am bound to say that I have the feeling that they held back the answer fearing they might supply me with ammunition for these estimates.

MR. GOODFELLOW: We would not do a thing like that.

MR. MacLEOD: If I had those answers, I could really ask some intelligent questions,. I have no doubt we will get the answer tomorrow, after the estimates are passed.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am very keenly disappointed that the government, through its department of Public Welfare, did not see fit to continue the pay-

ments of the monthly supplements to the old-age pensioners in the province of Ontario. I see no reason why this great, rich province of ours cannot do as well for its old-age pensioners as the much poorer province of British Columbia. The old-age pensioners in British Columbia get $60. a month, and if they can get it out there, with only a fraction of our wealth, why can we not continue that form of supplementary assistance to the old-age pensioners in this province?

I would be in favour of paying it to all of them. If the government is not prepared to do that, at least it should be prepared to do it for that limited category of people who received it under the old dispensation.

I have heard the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) say many times in this House, "Well, of course conditions vary", and the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow), and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) have been concerned during past Sessions about the possibility that some of these people who were getting $30. or $40. a month might be making money out of it -- could be building up a bank account. We have heard of people in Lindsay, who were getting an old-age pension, and making substantial contributions to local organizations, and so on. I do know much about London, and I do not know much about Northumberland county, but I do know something about the city of Toronto, as do many other hon. members in this House who are confronted with this problem, as I am.

Not long ago the Toronto Welfare Council looked into the situation, insofar as old-age pensioners are concerned, and they made quite an extensive study, and they gave us a few examples of how old people are faring in this great, rich, city of Toronto. They took the case of a man 75 years of age, living alone in a Toronto rooming-house, and they

worked out a monthly budget, of the minimum needed for helping him keep his self-respect, as they put it. I want to ask the hon. members of the House -- whether you come from Northumberland or Halton, or Hastings, or Glengarry, or Stormont, or the Simcoes, to listen to this. This is what this old gentleman is receiving, under the present system.

For food, $23.17 a month; for clothing and upkeep, $5.23; for personal care -- shaving and so forth -- and I would ask the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) to listen to this -- .83 cents a month; transportation, .50 cents a month; reading material, .25 cents a month.

MISS MACPHAIL: Not the Toronto Telegram.

MR. MacLEOD: No, you could not buy the Telegram once a week on that .25 cents.

Recreation, $1.08 a month and -- now listen to this -- religion, $1.08 per month. Why, you could not"get by" on that in the free church of Scotland.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Personal allowance -- that is to say, smoking, and so forth -- $2.17 per month; laundry $1.00 per month; health supplies -- that is to say, iodine and gauze, and other things necessary -- .10 cents a month; newspapers and radio, .96 cents a month; entertainment, .69 cents a month; room, at five dollars a week, $21.50 a month, making a total of $58.56, which, in the opinion of the Toronto Welfare Council, is the minimum. What a minimum it is. When these are all added up, they total $58.56, or $18.50 more than the old-age pensioners receive today, and that was before devaluation. Now it would run something like $22. less than the amount he receives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just about the time I came across that editorial, I looked at another page of the Star, and I

saw the story with this caption:

"Care for the Aged a Grave Problem".

That is very true, because only the grave can solve the problem of people who have to"get by" on a pension like that. It is a grave problem..

MR. JOLLIFFE: Some of them may be waiting for the grave.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, that is right. They are too poor to live, and are too rich to die.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I saying to the House, that in view of the fact that we had $21 million to spare this year, and in view of the fact that the government of Ontario has been throwing away a contribution to the federal Liberal campaign, of $15 million a year, for the last three or four years, and in view of the fact that there are many additional sources of revenue at the disposal of the government, I say -- in view of these things -- it is nothing but a disgrace that we should be compelling these people who -- as the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) said the other day -- have contributed so much to the wealth of the province of Ontario. She spoke of a friend she had visited in a home for the aged in Grey County, and the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) said this woman had created a great deal of wealth in her time,had made a great deal of butter, and done other things, which contributed to the wealth of Ontario, and yet these people, hundreds of thousands of them, are living in the city, and are forced to live below the pauper level, at a time when the province of Ontario is fully capable of giving them that additional $10. a month, which might make the difference between living like paupers, and living with, at least, a minimum of self-respect.

While I have the greatest respect and affection for the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) I am sorry he finds himself in the unhappy position of being a minister of the government which takes such a cold-hearted view of human needs.

Now, to leave that for a moment, I want to say that what the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) said tonight about the "new approach to h the aged", I think we are all agreed that the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) and his officials are making serious efforts to humanize these institutions, and I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if I had the answer to my question about these institutions, I would have the kind of information that would not make them feel very proud, because I feel that many of the so-called "homes for the aged" in the province of Ontario today belong in the category of the poor-houses which Dickens castigated away back in the 1840's. They are not "homes for the aged"; they are "poor-houses".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Certainly. The description of the one given in Hastings County the other day, would not make me feel that I wanted to go there. There is nothing personal in that remark. I am going by what the hon. members (Mr. Robson) said.

We have homes for the aged in Ontario today, I am informed -- though not by the government -- which go back to the Confederation period, and certainly we did not have the same human approach to this problem back in 1867 which the present hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has today. We do not hold him responsible for what happened at the time of Confederation. He was a very young man then.

But here they are, and we have got to do something

about them, and while I agree with the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) that it is a fairly substantial sum of money we have in the estimates, I think it is very small, when it is related to the homes for the aged, and the number of them which are needed in this province. I am afraid it will take us a long time to get the type of institutions, or the type of homes required for these people.

I was up at the Head of the Lakes a couple of months ago, and I looked at the one in Fort William. It is a disgrace. If a fire ever occurred in that so-called "home for the aged", in the city of Fort William, I doubt if anybody would get out of there alive. It is a disgraceful situation. It is a disgrace to the city of Fort William, and I am sorry the hon member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) is not in his place at the moment.

It looks like one of the Malton places, with shingles on it, or one in Little Norway. It is a shameful place.

I remember last year, when the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) Bill was before us, I questioned him about the old Christie St. place, and he gave a good answer. He said, "As a home for the aged, it would make a good boiler factory". After he let that drop, we find, a year later, people living in the "boiler factory". We have aged people living there now. I think, Mr. Chairman, the department was short-sighted when it refused to make some of the private institutions available for these grants, because I feel that the Church of England, the Odd Fellows, and other fraternal organizations who maintain homes for their own aged, would be able to do a much better job than they are now doing, if they got some form of assistance in the way of a capital grant from the government. I think that was a short-sighted policy. I know of one insti-

tution in my own riding in the city of Toronto, with which the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is familiar, operated by an Order of Sisters -- the St. Mary's Home. They are very wonderful people over there, but they are crowded. They have these old people living in the place, which I do not think is any too safe. I do not feel very comfortable when those old people are living in the third story of that building. I would like to see them out of there, and I think instead of putting the pressure on them, instead of letting these people out, with no place to go, the department might consider helping that Order to build a new home somewhere in the outskirts of the city of Toronto, because I do not think we can match the kind of service these Sisters are giving these aged people.

I think that the department, even at this stage, should reconsider the matter, and try to devise some means whereby the government can help those who are already doing an excellent job, and who by temperament, and so on, are particularly equipped to take care of this class of persons.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) this question; how many people do we have in these homes in Ontario today?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think there are approximately six thousand in the municipal homes.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) will agree with me when I say that there are perhaps another six thousand people who would like to be in a home for the aged, if it were not for the stigma attached to going into what in that community is regarded as a "poor-house". People do not want to go to the poor-house, and if there was a home for the aged of the type the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) has in mind, I have no doubt but that many

of these people who are not being properly cared for now, would like to find refuge in the closing years of their lives, in places they could regard as home.

So, Mr. Chairman, to sum up, I hope that the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) will plead with his colleagues in the government to re-instate the $10. monthly supplementary payment to all old-age pensioners in this province; secondly, that the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) will reconsider the policy announced last year with respect to these private organizations who are already operating homes for the aged, and who with some supplementary assistance from the government could expand their facilities, and take care of a larger number of these people.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing I omitted to say when I was speaking before. So far as I know, the most comfortable place for the aged are in private homes. Like some which are kept by two people, sometimes a couple, sometimes a widow, sometimes two or three people, getting together and getting a big house in a village or twon, and taking in these old-age pensioners, but, unfortunately, they have to take most of their pensions in order to run the place. From my experience from the ones I have visited, I think the old people in these homes are much more comfortable, and feel less the stigma attached to them, than do those who go to the county homes. I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is right when he says if it is ever known as a poor-house, or house of refuge, there is a stigma attached to it, but if they go into these homes in the villages -- and they are mostly in the villages -- or the small towns, which are run properly, they are much more happy, and more than likely are established nearer the

community in which they are best acquainted.

I do not know how it could be done, but I think it would help quicker, by helping these well-run homes. Of course, that would mean an inspection system; they would have to be visited, but I think it would be a better occupation for the investigators to investigate these homes, than to go around making the old people miserable, by trying to unearth the last cent they have, for fear they might get a pension too soon.

I know of a case in East York, of a couple, the old gentleman is 79 and his wife is 78, and they are applying for an old-age pension now, and apparently they were very much upset about the inspector. I think we should take into consideration the fact that they did not ask for it very soon. We have saved nine years on the gentleman, and eight years on the lady, and that ought to be enough, I should think, yet they have been upset by an investigator. I think even if the investigator had to go around and investigate the homes, it might be a better way for the inspectors to spend their time, than to make elderly people unhappy, such as this old couple in my constituency, 79 and 78 years of age, respectively.

I would just say again what I have said before, that I think it would be much better for the investigators to go around and investigate these homes, than to go around and investigate to such an embarrassing extent, the persons who are applying for old-age pensions.

I want to rather dispute the opinion of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) in regard to the Fort William home. I have been there, and I have tasted the food and went into the common-room. It is true it is not well equipped for fire, but at least, until a fire occurs, they were living more comfortably. That is something. The people in that home

do not do the work. It is run by a couple. The meals are prepared. Guests can assist if they like, and it is better than a lot of them, which have finer exteriors.

It is true there are not very many doors or escapes, but after all, I am not sure that is as cruel as some of the homes or institutions which have no home facilities, no comforts, and no liberty for the people in them. When I think, as I said before when I spoke in this House, when I went to see my old friend who had paid the mortgage on her farm, and helped to set up her son on the farm, but now is in a house of refuge -- when I went to see her, there was a guard walking back and forth in front of the door all the time I talked to her, for fear she would say something to me, or I would say something to her which should not be said. If I had my choice, I would rather go up in smoke at the end --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am speaking of this, of course, -- than to live in an institution under such scrutiny. I think even with that situation, it has its points. I think the people in the home in Fort William find it far better to have some place where there is some liberty, and where there was more of a humane administration, even though the building was very cheap, one secured after the war -- just after the war was ended -- by the government.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to revert back to the question asked by the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) namely, would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) explain to us now, before we go into the various items, this question of property. It is a very important question, and is causing a great deal of concern to a lot of people, and certainly there is a lot of misunderstanding

and confusion as to the rights of property that is once assigned for the purpose of qualifying for the old-age pension. I would like to have the policy explained, so we can give an answer to the people who request that information, in our constituencies.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I might say, Mr. Chairman, in respectto estates; it causes more concern in the department than I think it does to the people interested in the estate, because it is one of those things which is very difficult to explain.

As a matter of fact, a month ago we prepared a press release which went tout to all the papers in the province, in the hope that the people would get some conception of what was involved in respect to the collection of the assets of pensioners.

There is great misunderstanding, and it is most unfortunate that a great many people have the impression that the commission, of necessity, would collect their estate, and they hesitate to make application for a pension. That is most unfortunate, because actually, under the present federal old-age pension regulations, an elderly couple can have a fairly substantial property, and still qualify for a pension, assuming no collections would be made.

It is the policy, of course, set up by federal regulations, to collect on all estates over $2,000., but great discretion is used in that respect by the commission, where it can be proven that a son or daughter have made some contribution by caring for the aged pensioners during their lifetime.

We try in every way possible to take these things into consideration. But there is a great deal of misunderstanding, and I think that is one of the main reasons why we should do away with the means test as soon as possible.

(Take CC follows)

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): I want to join those who have paid their compliments to the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for the administration of his department and to those who have made comments about the chairman of the old-age pensions.

I am disappointed about the length of time it takes an ordinary applicant for a pension to receive the pension. I have had several cases brought to my attention, and I know there has been undue delay. but when I got into the question the chairman satisfied me very quickly, and brought them to the top of the file. There have been several cases in my constituency where there have been delays of three and four months from the time the application was made to the time the pension was received. When they were eventually paid, they were paid back to the date of the application, but that was not helpful during the period of the three and four months that they were waiting. I was wondering whether the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) does not feel a desire to increase the size of his staff so that it could be speeded up.

That is one question. There is a matter which deals with policy which should be raised now while dealing with the first item. There is an entirely new welfare problem developing, and I would ask the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for a statement of the viewpoint of his department. That is the question of unemployment relief as it arises throughout Ontario. I know that a number of municipalities have made representations to the government of Ontario to assume the responsibility for the welfare costs for unemployed employables. Here in Toronto we have a problem where there are a large number of people who have gone through their unemployment insurance and have nothing more coming to them, and the problem of how they are going to be

taken care of is left on the doorstep of the municipality. This is a matter of serious concern and it will become more serious. The federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) said we had reached normality. If this is mormality we will have to worry about this problem of persons who are unemployed and have no rights under unemployment insurance. Could we have a statement as to the attitude of this government on assuming the cost of all relief for the employable unemployed?

MR. GOODFELLOW: In connection with the first question, this has been dealt with, in many cases, by granting pensions. We have been going through strenuous times and the extension of old-age pension applications average a net increase of somewhere from 500. to 900. a month, and it is difficult to keep up with the increases. As you will recall during the past year, we had to make about three complete changes, and had to go through 18,000 files, due to the change in pensions from the $25.00 to the $40. mark which the federal government announced one month later. That is one of the reasons why the branch has had difficulty in keeping up.

Also, we have had considerable difficulty and some delay in respect to securing proof of age. We are hoping that it will be possible to speed it up in the future.

Regarding unemployment relief for employables: as you know, we have an Unemployment Relief Act on the statute books of Ontario, which was amended, I think, about 1939 or 1940 Up to that time, the provinces shared with the federal government and municipalities. It is a system of public assistance to a group who cannot qualify for old-age pensions or mothers' allowance.

We do not think we are "passing the buck" onto the federal government. We feel, at the present time, that the

federal government, with offices across Canada, and with unemployment, as such, due to economic reasons, that the unemployment of employables, should definitely be the responsibility of the federal government. If we get into it, the municipalities would be brought in, and it would be crippling financially to the municipalities, and we have to realize that the federal government has taxing powers not available to the municipal governments.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): I would like to say that the municipalities are into this unemployment problem now. At the conference last Saturday morning, I found out from the welfare officials,-and I know from personal experience,-they are not letting employable people starve. Not only the single unemployed, but also the families of the unemployed, are getting regular help. At the meeting of provincial and federal members at the city hall, a motion was moved and carried unanimously by those present, and all political parties were represented, that the federal and provincial governments should assume the whole cost of relief for employable people.

I would like to say also to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) both of whom I respect very much, -- they both made the statement recently that they are in favour of doing away with the means test. It is unfortunate that this statement was not made earlier, and with much more force. Had that statement been made earlier, I do not think we would have the situation at Ottawa today where there seems to be an attempt to evade election promises in regard to the abolition of the means test.

If that statement had been made one year ago, that

the government of Ontario was strongly against the means test, we would not have the present situation. The hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) said he did not know about the Cabinet, but he did say that he was against the means test.

Our government should tell the federal government, without any quibbling, that we wish to abolish the means test at the earliest possible time, and that we believe the means test is unfair, and puts a penalty on old people who have saved and been thrifty, and we feel it is unjust and we we want it abolished. If the government had made that clear, I would think we would not have the situation at Ottawa at the present time.

One hon. member made a statement in Toronto on February 14th, that "social security" is the official policy of the Liberal party, and another thing, that it was the "refuge of the coward." He was the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Hon. Mr. Martin himself, even after his promises, is now making statements that indicate he believes the federal government have not themoney to do this. He says it would cost $750. million to pay $50. a month at the age of 65. That is a great deal of money, We must remember before the last election there were two promises. One was made to the Corporations of Canada that the excess profits tax would be removed, and that $433. million would be taken off. The other promise was made to the old people, that the means test would be taken off.

Obviously both promises could not be kept, and the people who got relief were the corporations, instead of the old-age pensioners. I think that is the situation, and I would urge the government to make their stand clear. But there are forces within their own political party, federal

and provincial, who will put up resistance to that suggestion.

I have a clipping from the Evening Telegram of February 2nd, 1950, and it agrees with hon. Mr. Martin that it cannot be done. I would estimate that perhaps 50 per cent of the newspapers in Ontario are opposed to it. The Evening Telegram said that if this was dropped and pensions paid to everyone at 70, prior to the introduction of a contributory fee, an additional burden of $100 million would be placed on the public treasury, and they go on to say that it is not the position of the Conservative Party.

It was the position of the Conservative Party on the 18th September, 1948, when they stated they were in favour of a contributory pension at 65, but until that was brought into effect, they were in favour of abolishing the means test on existing pensions. I think the pledge was sincerely made in September, 1948, and the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is sincere when he says he wants to get rid of it.

What has to be done now is to eliminate that means test and it must be backed up with all the strength and resources the government can bring to bear.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Before going into the itemized estimates, I would like to say a word or two on some of the statements which have been made, and on some of the observations which have been made.

I was interested in listening to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) for whom I have a very high personal regard; I was interested in his saying to the House he was for the abolition of the means test, if Ottawa pays the bill, and that we should give help to the employables, so long as Ottawa paid 100 per cent of the bill.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I did not say that. I said I hoped

they would share.

MR. OLIVER: That point is important. We will get into the position of the 1930's if we are not careful, and we will say to the federal government, "Do this and that", and the federal government will say, "The province should assume a greater share."

It seems inconceivable that the government of this province with $21 million in their vest pockets as a surplus, could not do something toward eliminating the means test, and helping those municipalities that are paying the full shot on unemployment relief in the province. We have to be serious and sensible, and we have to admit that we have a responsibility in the matter; we have to admit that some obligation rests on our shoulders to discharge our responsibility as the Legislature of this province.

I wish to say, also, to my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. that he seems to be worrying about whether the Dominion government will live up to its obligations and promises. I think we can be assured in this House that the Dominion Liberal party, which is the government party, has done more to advance the cause of provincial security in this country than any other government this country ever had. And any promise, if promise it be, made to the public of the Dominion of Canada, will, I am convinced, be carried out. It is easy for my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) to make these wild promises of his; he is a member of a promising party. My hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) is the dean of a promising party.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: The only thing that saves him is that the people have not put into his hands the responsibility

of carrying his promises into action.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: If they should ever do that, then we can stand in our places and say to him, "You promised this and you promised that, and these promises you have not fulfilled".

MR. DENNISON: I will ask the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) if he agrees that the government should help the municipalities on relief.

MR. OLIVER: I doubt if any government has done more than the Liberal government. When the situation became less critical, of course, the conditions altered, and the present situation was examined. The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is only shadow-boxing. There was no need to give aid when any man who wanted to work could find a job. That situation does not exist today.

To come back to more rational things, concerning the question of houses of refuge and the whole problem of finding accommodation for our old people, I feel like the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) that these private homes are well-established and well-run and will increasingly help to relieve the load. I believe we will come to the point where we will not only inspect these homes, but that we will pay a grant towards their maintenance. When we come to that stage we will have gone a long way to better the situation of our old people.

I know, personally, of at least a half dozen of these homes, and I know of old people who, in some instances, came out of a House of Refuge and went into these homes. They were well-run, and in the locality where these people had lived all their lives. They are close to people they know and they can visit them, and people can come in and

converse with them. I suggest to the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) that the time is not far off when we will inspect these homes -- that is important, if we are going to have an increased number of the homes, and some sort of inspection must be set up,- and if we set up an inspection service we are justified in paying something toward the maintenance. We are as justified in doing that as we are in contributing to the Houses of Refuge. If they are taking the place of Refuges and doing the job in a good and efficient way, we are bound to support these homes as we support the refuges.

I would say that this is one solution to this problem, and I know the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) being a humanitarian, will give due consideration to it.

MR. W. E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings West): In connection with these refuge homes, it is embarrassing that some people think these homes are not run properly, and that the people there are unhappy. I wrote out a few things that we have done in the home of which I was superintendent, and we are not the only home that tries to do everything we can to make the people happy.

We have church services every Sunday and we also have church organizations that come in and give concerts through the week, and seldom a week passes that we will not have two organizations in to entertain the old people. We have moving pictures, and organizations who come into the homes and put on different reels. We rent busses to take them to our cottage. We have birthday parties for the people, and they may invite their friends and their little cliques to these parties. At Christmas time I also take the old ladies down the street to do their Christmas shopping and we have Christmas trees and everyone gets a present, young

and old, and also a lot of enjoyment was derived from a motor boat which I had in front of the home. We had Hallowe'en parties, and everything was done to make these people happy.

These people are happy, and there were many times when friends would come to take them out for a visit, and they would not go because they thought they might not be brought back. We have papers and magazines for them to read, and the blind people have radios. I think there are fifteen to eighteen radios in the house.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): What will we have to do to get there?

MR. SANDERCOCKL There is fire protection in the home. The building is 55 years old, and there is a hydrant at every corner of the house. We have a fire alarm system direct to the station, and all kinds of fire equipment in the building.

It grieves me to think that people think these persons are not happy. I know that the majority are happy. There is always the odd grouch from those who are not satisfied with anything.

I would like to say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that he might do worse in his later days.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): I want to raise a couple of points on vote 154, item number 5; "indigents not exceeding $40. in each case". I want to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if we are to limit it to $40. $40. seems a miserable sum.

(Take DD follows)

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) said that if a grave was to be the end of the old-age pension problem, then it is a very low treatment even in the grave, if he has to rely on that.

MR. MacLEOD: We tried to change that a few years ago, and my colleague, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg) and I were the only ones who voted for an increase.

MR. PARK: I think it is a matter to be looked into, and the government ought to be prepared to say something about that item, $1,600. for the burial of indigents and $3.750. for flowers for the memorial wreaths.

MR. S. J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr.Chairman, after listening to the eloquence of the hon. member from Snake River -- he happens to come from my riding --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HUNT: I was tempted to ask a couple of questions of the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow). I believe that prior to the increase from $30,000. to $32,000. last spring, that the maximum income an old-age pensioner might have was $600. I am subject to correction.

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is correct.

MR. HUNT: Now, this is not in any way a criticism of what was done at Ottawa. If their legislation were perfect there would be no need of their hon. members sitting there, just as there would be no need of us sitting here, trying to improve from year to year, but the old-age pensioners, prior to our last Session here, received $360. a year, and were allowed to earn up to $240. for a mximum of $600. If the increase was right at Ottawa, it was brought up to $400. a year, and the maximum was still $600., allowing them only $10. a month that they might earn on their own if they saw fit to go out and take a day's work. That is one principle in

the Old-Age Pension Act that I object to, that I do not like. I think they might have at that time made some provision, and I think it was an oversight, that they will bring that total up to $720. so the old-age pensioner may go out and earn $20. a month to supplement his income, and still draw a full pension.

There is another thing that I believe has been in effect, and I believe it is only on insitance from Ottawa where they pay 75 percent. of that pension if an old-age pensioner has an income over a certain amount, they must invest that in a government annuity, and the government will reduce their pension by a certain amount, and they are only allowed to use that money for, I believe, it is hospital expenses, or burial expenses. They can use it for cost of living. That is a question I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to answer. I would like to ask the hon. member who represents Toronto (Mr. Park) has he ever found any reluctance on the part of the Old-Age Pension Board to go into any of its pension cases and make them retro-active in cases where they have been delayed.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): If that were addressed to me --

MR. HUNT: No, it was for the hon. member who represents Toronto so much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HUNT: The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park).

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr.Chairman, in reply to the question of the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt), I might say it is not necessary for them to invest it in annuities, but we use the Dominion government annuity schedules for establishing the income from assets, which applicants have. That is, the assets they have are set up on an annuity basis as to what they would yeild per year at age 70, and that is calculated as income.

I might also say in respect to his question that it does seem unfortunate that the pensioners are not allowed a larger outside income.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Just tonight, going through the corridor, going down to dinner, an old gentleman stopped me and said he and his wife are both drawing a pension of $40. a month, and he is running into difficulty with the Commission because he earned last summer $400. Now, all he and his wife are allowed is $120. a year outside income, and it is unfortunate that the outside income is not greater than it is, because a great many elderly couples, especially in the cities, require more than $1,080. to maintain themselves.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, speaking of outside income, what about our old friend, 94 years of age, who was paying back, because what he got was too much. Is he still living, or has he slipped out from under?

MR. GOODFELLOW: We must check on that pensioner of yours to see whether he is alive or not.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I rather thought the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would say something on this Item No. 5. We had a very sharp discussion on this item a couple of years ago, the item of burial of indigents, "not exceeding $40. in each case".

MISS MACPHAIL: You can hardly get the wood to make the box for that.

MR. MacLEOD: Many hon. members from Toronto in this house have had the painful experience of arranging for funerals, arranging funeral services for people who died in institutions or outside of institutions, and they know just as well as I do that the cheapest funeral--and how cheap it is--the cheapest funeral you can get in the city of Toronto today, and I suppose

the same would also be true of Hamilton, Windsor -- is $100. I think there is a $99. special by MacDougall and Brown, that you see advertised in the streetcars.

Now, is it not a scandelous thing that these people who have no income, absolutely disinherited, a charge on society, come to the end of their days, and they get a $40. funeral. Well, of course, it cannot hurt them, but it is a terrible thing that those who are left, undoubtedly people with some pride, that they should have to be humiliated by attending a $40. funeral. Surely the government of Ontario could bring that up to the Toronto minimum of $100. a funeral, becauss you cannot get anything cheaper here. I do not know what you bury these people in for $40. That is allow they allow -- $40. -- "not exceeding $40."

To paraphrase Mr. King, "$40. if not necessary, but not necessarily $40."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: What is your explanation? I cannot believe you would permit a thing like that to happento anaged person.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think the hon. member (Mr. MacLoed) knows there is an arrangement we have with undertakers across the province to bury indigents for $40. .

MR. MacLEOD: Then, they will give you a $100. funeral for $40.?

MR. DOUCETT: They will charge you more than that.

MR. MacLEOD: I have no doubt about that, but I am gla d there is an explanation. I did not knowyou were getting a discount.

MR. NIXON: They tack it on to the next rich man they bury.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr Chairman, I am rather surprized to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) say

that the undertakers have agreed to a $40. burial service. Up to last year, we, in Niagara Falls, were paying $50. for indigents, and the undertakers appeared before council and explained very fairly that they could not do a funeral for under $100., and we, in Niagara Falls, like a lot of other municipalities increased the amount to $100., and I think the government should follow the example of the municipalities.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, on 154, Item 21, $100,000. Is an appropriation made for optical care for welfare recipients? On a question of cases like that, I know of several old-age pensioners in Sault Ste. Marie who are walking around without any glasses who can hardly see. They seem to have considerable trouble trying to get aid in that respect. I was wondering if there should not be some care for old-age pensioners, for optical care.

MR. GOODFELLOW: There is no appropriation for that.

Vote No. 154 agreed to.

On Vote 155.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, the women who, of necessity, work outside of the home are very anxious for the continuance of day nurseries throughout the city. I do not know much about how many there are, and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to tell us something about day nurseries under his Department.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, it is an arrangement that we have with the municipalities. As the hon. member (Miss Macphail) knows, day nurseries were established during the war years, of necessity, and when the federal government pulled out their 50 percent. share they were paying toward the cost, the municipalities -- we passed the legislation where the municipalities could continue day nurseries, and we would subsidize them 50 percent. I might say, at the present time, there are 18 day nurseries in the province.

MISS MACPHAIL: Where are they? Mostly in Toronto?

MR. GOODFELLOW: They are mostly in Toronto. There are about 12 in Toronto out of the 18.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) this question, in view of the answer you gave a moment ago on this matter of the burials; now, since you have that arrangement, is there any reason why you have to have that printed in the Estimates? Why could you not leave that out, "not to exceed $40."? Why do you have to have that in there, and make whatevee arrangements you want with the funeral directors?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I will look into the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod).

Vote 155 agreed to.

On Vote 156.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, on speaking on the Throne Speech Debate the other day, I referred to the question of men who have deserted their wives and families, and also to the question of children of unmarried mothers. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if he does not think we are becoming too complacent towards what is going on in this connection, and also whether or not we could not have the provincial police assist municipalities in bringing back for trial fathers who have gone away and left their families. I know in the smaller municipalities of northern Ontario, it is placing a tremendous burden on them, the last five or six years; this burden has more than doubtled, and part of the cause is our own complacency. Some years ago the Children's Aid assisted in cases of unmarried mothers, and they would search out the father, bring him back and give him a trial, but today all that is done is bill the municipality for the upkeep of the child.

In connection with the desertion of families, I have know where the local municipal police have approached the mother and asked her if she would not contribute towards the cost of sending a police officer to bring the deserting father back for trial. Now, that is not right. The man who deserts his family has committed a crime; it is a crime under the Criminal Code, as well as a crime against one of our provincial statutes, and I think now is the time we did something to put a stop to this practice. It is becoming too prevalent. Too many men are assuming the responsibilities of a husband and a father, and then when they feel like it, walking away, leaving their families to the mercy of the municipalities.

I was wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr.Goodfellow) could not in some way co-operate with the Attorney-General's Department, and perhaps place provincial police at the disposal of the municipalities so that they could, immediately a man leaves a family, send for him, and if they know where he is, bring him back and punish him as he should be punished.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, under 156, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow): are many children being adopted from the children's shelter?

MR. GOODFELLOW: In respect of the matter raised by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), I think we all agree that there is a tendency for too much irresponsibility on the part of a great many fathers of families, and I do believe that that further effort is being made in most cases. Usually an effort is made to bring the deserting father back to the family, but, on the other hand, in so many instances today, you bring them back, and you not only have to support the family, but you have also to support the father in jail. That is, if he does not want to come back and stay with his family, is there much point in forcing him to come back?

I think it is something that cannot be encouraged, and

they should be brought back to justice, and see that they do assume their proper responsibilities.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, in that connection, supposing a man is brought back and punished, we should look at it from the viewpoint of meting out punishment. If several of these men were sent back to their municipalities and sent to jail for a few months, you would find other men hesitating before they took the same step.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if there were many children being adopted out of the various children's shelters.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I understand there are about 2,000 a year adopted in the province.

MR. C. K. FOSTER (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, under Vote 156, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) if that change in the Estimates last year to the volunteer societies had increased in respect to the government? I see there is a raise of $100.,-- would that be due to the effect of last year's change in the Act?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes, I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Foster) that there has been, they have been much more successful in their canvasses for private funds, and as a result of that, our payment on the 25 percent. basis will be greater. I might say we are receiving many letters commending us for making that grant, because it has given the necessary incentive to Children's Aid Societies, to collect through private funds.

Votes 156 and 157 agreed to.

On Vote 158.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, in connection with 158, Mothers' Allowances Branch, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) tell me what the means test is in this case, for a mother to qualify to get the pension for her children,

or the allowance for her children? Here is a case where Ottawa does not come into the picture, and any action could be taken by this government without consulting them.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I might say we are very generous as far as Mothers' allowances are concerned, because that is entirely under our jurisdiction, and every mother is placed on a budget of her own, according to what the Commission considers is her need.

MR. MacLEOD: Are you in favour of abolishing the means test from that?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, we have no means test.

MR. ROBINSON: Is there any optical care in that item?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I did not catch the question.

MR. ROBINSON: Vote 158, Item 5, medical services, $247,000. Is there any optical care in there?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, that is just medical care.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, I had not quite finished the point I was enquiring about. There was one case that came to my notice, where the father had been killed in an automobile accident, and the court awarded the mother $3,000., a thousand for each of the children. Now, that money was taken in charge by the official guardian, but before she could get any mothers' allowance, she had to agree that all the assets in excess of $1,000. must be so arranged as to provide for a monthly payment which would completely retire the moneys by the time the youngest child became 16 years of age. Why should you have such a regulation?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That has been in force for years.

MR. NIXON: The moneys that the official guardian,has, namely $3,000. will have to be retired in about 180 months, which would be approximately $16. a month. In this particular case, the mother was getting along without using this amount

of $3,000. in the hands of the official guardian, and yet your Department says, to get the mothers' allowance, you must spend every cent by the time the youngest child is 16 years of age.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Except $1,000.

MR. NIXON: Now, if my experience with a family is anything to judge by, I find that is the time I want some money in hand to look after my children, after they are 16 years of age; and why you should insist that she should be utterly broke, without a cent at that time, is beyond my understanding.

MR. GOODFELLOW: It must be that we are not progressive, and have carried that down from the former administration.

MR. NIXON: You have given us the brush-off with that sort of thing for too long. I do not know whether I have ever come across anything of this kind under the former administration, but here is an incident in hand, and kindly give me an explanation. The court awarded $3,000. to the children, and it was more of a case of generosity under the law, because certainly the case in point was one in which evidently the responsibility for the accident was entirely with the father of these children.

It is something I just cannot understand; there is no justice in it, that you should insist that this mother should be destitute so far as this fund is concerned.

This money was put in her hands by the court at the time of the accident or shortly after, and she will not have any of that money when the youngest child is 16 years of age.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, that has been a rule that has been followed for a great many years, that there is $1,000. and the balance is sort of an insurance annuity to be retired when the youngest child is 16 years of age.

MR. NIXON: But if they can get along and still have a little bit left, surely you are not interested?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Perhaps we should raise it.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): I onder in this same connection, has the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) given any thought to the attendance of children in school. I recall a few years ago the time was extended to the end of the school period if the child had reached 16 years of age. In other words, you carried mothers' allowance on to the end of the school period, but then it ceased. I know of two or three instances which have created quite a hardship on mothers' allowances cases. one of an excellent student -- I checked with the principal of the school -- he was a real student, and yet he had to be plucked out of school and go to work because his mother was out of work, and he was the only support. I am wondering if the government would give any thought to extending that, particularly where the student happened to be qualified, or upon the recommendation of the principal or some such qualification. Could it not be extended due to circumstances?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, we have not given any consideration to that. We did extend it to the end of the school year, after they reached 16.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) must see another problem coming up on this mothers' allowance branch, and that is, these mothers, when the youngest child is 16 years of age, are tired out, and have reached an age when it is difficult for her and she is left just "left". She just has to do the best she can. Probably her children help her, but today they go out unprepared at 16 years of age, and they do very well if they keep themselves. I fancy that this is going to become more and more aggravated until it is necessary to do something to continue some allowance for the mother. I do not know whether it will be a grant, or in what way it will be done. I cannot think of anything else. How is she going to live? Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) considered how that mother is

going to live from the time the youngest child is 16, until the mother is 70?

MR. MacLEOD: What is the answer?

MR. J. D. BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, before we conclude mothers' allowances, I had a case brought to my attention the other day. It is not the one the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) thinks it is. He has been very kind to me in one particular case. We asked about the case, and I am afraid I will have to admit he is right. However, in this particular case, it is the mother of three children, whose husband went overseas and came back and found that he had no further affection for her, and he went out west, and he eventually, or she eventually, got a divorce. In the awarding of the divorce decree, the judge awarded -- through knowledge of what the husband earned -- $35. a month to the mother for the up-keep of these children. That was about three years ago.

She has been trying since then to carry on as best she can, get as much work as she possibly can, either clerical or domestic work, and to keep the family together. Recently she finally decided she could not carry on that way any longer, and made application for mothers' allowance. In investigating it further, I am led to believe that the law at present is that if she gets any assistance it will have to come from the municipality in the way of relief, in view of the fact that she is already receiving this $35. a month from her husband as partial assistance.

Now, in this particular case, she lives in a small community, and you all know what the feeling is there about relief recipients. She has tried , and is trying to carry on, and she would only apply for mothers' allowance, believing it would be something between her and the Department of Public Welfare. I am wondering in this case, why the Welfare Department could not supplement the $35. that would ordinarily be

available for her as a mother of three dependents, rather than send her to the relief department of the municipality?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) will agree with me that we have to be rather careful when we start subsidizing divorced people, inasmuch as we do not want to encourage any more of it than we have at the present time. On the other hand, there are certain discretionary powers in the mothers' allowance Act and I would advise the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) to bring the case over to our department.

Vote 158 agreed to.

On Vote 159.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, under Vote 159, under the similar item last year, I raised the question then of the request that was received by a guardian for an old-age pensioner to return $1.94 to the Provincial Treasurer because the pensioner died two days before the end of the month. I was assured that that was not the intention or the policy of the government.

This year, I ran into another case where the pension for the month of January, I guess it was, had been paid prior to the Christmas date. Presumably, that is what was done by the Board, to allow pensioners to have a little extra spending money prior to Christmas. Well, in this case, the pensioner died two days after Christmas, so I immediately wrote to the Board, it having been brought to my attention, asking the Board whether there were any returns to be made in this case, in view of the fact that here it was not yet January, and yet the entire pension had been paid in this particular case. I was assured by the Chairman of the Board that it had been the practice for years that no claim would be made for the return of such sums.

Now, what I want to know is, does this apply now across the board, or is it just in respect of payments made prior to Christmas, that they are not returnable, or does it apply to

any payment that is made and the pensioner dies before the entire payment is used up? Is there any return to be made out of the payments given in the case of pensioners who die prior to the using up of that pension?

The reason I ask the question particularly is, to go back to the other item referred to by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), regarding burial expenses, because it seems to me in a great many cases if there was any request for return of the unused portion of the pension, then there would be a little bit at least towards the expenses at the time, nursing expenses, or expenses at the time of death. I would like that made clear. I want to know now whether it is the policy of the board that in all cases where a payment is made and death takes place prior to the entire payment being used, if there is anything in the way of requests for the return of the unused portion?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, that could only happen in the month of December when the cheques are made payable before the end of the month arrives. Cheques are put out at the end of each month, the end of the month in which the payment is due, so it could only happen in December. I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) as far as we are concerned provincially, we should assume 100 percent. of that overpayment if the federal authorities happened to catch up with us for recovery purposes.

Vote 159 agreed to.

(Take EE- follows)

On vote 160.

MR. MacLEOD: If you do not mind, on vote 160, the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) mentioned one home about to be completed in Algoma, near Sault Ste. Marie, and the other in an area represented by the hon. member for Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock). And may I digress and say when I get to be of an age where I may have to find refuge, there is no place I would like to live better than under your superintendency.

There is one in Hastings county, one at Sault Ste. Marie; are there any others coming?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The hon. member for Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock) referred to an existing home in Hastings county. There is one in Belleville --

MR. MacLEOD: Does that mean we only have the two?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The combined counties of Glengarry, Dundas and Stormont, are building one. They have made arrangements at Oshawa, in the county of Ontario, to build a home there. In the Sudbury district, they have passed a by-law, and are giving serious consideration to it, and by-laws I am quite sure have been passed in both Rainy River and Kenora, and there are several other counties. I think Grey county is giving consideration to an addition to their existing home. Many other municipalities have shown an interest in this, and have architects drawing plans up for them.

MR. MacLEOD: How many institutions in the province are now available for the grant?

MR. GOODFELLOW: All municipalities.

MR. MacLEOD: That would be a total of what? Nine hundred?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Oh, no.

MR. DOUCETT: Southern Ontario is comprised of 37 counties

MR. GOODFELLOW: The cities might have homes, in addition to the counties.

MR. MacLEOD: Is the department taking any interest in having any part or share in determining the architecture of these homes?

MR. GOODFELLOW: We have been working for the architects, and giving them suggestions.

MR. MacLEOD: They are two-stories at the most?

MR. GOODFELLOW: One story.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you use the ramp system, instead of the stairs?

MR. GOODFELLOW: There would not be any stairs in them because they are only one story.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): I think, Mr. Chairman, none of us will disagree, -- after the hon. member for Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock) had spoken, that we have a very good home in his county, and if all of them were as good as the supervision in Hastings West, it would be a happier situation. I was quite impressed, really, with what he said. I think, however, this may be the one exception which proves the rule. There are not many homes with which I come in contact, I am very sorry to say, which have a program as extensive and fine as the one he outlines. At least we are thankful that Hastings West has done as well as it has.

Votes 160 and 161 agreed to.

On vote 162.

MR. MacLEOD: Is that unemployment relief?

Well, Mr. Chairman, frankly I think that something more needs to be said on that item. As the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) and the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) have already mentioned, the hon. members of this Legis-

lature from the city of Toronto and the federal members of Parliament were summoned to the city hall on Saturday morning to confer with the members of the board of control on the local unemployment problem. It is estimated that there are between 27,000 and 25,000 unemployed in this city, and quite a substantial number of these people -- I do not know what the percentage is; perhaps the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) would know --

MR. PARK: Somebody said 5,000.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes -- are not drawing any unemployment relief at all. These people are penniless; they have absolutely nothing. Many of the people who sat in the Chabmer with us -- and we had about a dozen or so in the delegation -- were quite obviously people who were suffering from hunger and mal-nutrition. They have been here; they have been before the board of control, and a few of them went to Ottawa to see the federal authorities. They go to the city hall, and are sent to Queen's Park. The come to Queen's Park, and are sent to Ottawa. They go to Ottawa, and are sent back to the city hall. They go to the city hall, and are sent back to Queen's Park. The statement was made that this problem is being treated as a political football, and one of the Liberal members of the federal House took strong exception to that. He said both the governments were anxious to do all they could; they understood the problem, and so on, and so forth. One of those unemployed got up before this group, including the member of the federal House, and he said, "The more you say you people understand our problem, and our difficulties, the more I am convinced you do not understand it at all", and he pointed the accusing finger, and said, "How would you like to live on $1.50 a week."?

What on earth are these people going to do? They have nothing. They are drawing no unemployment relief benefits. Many of them have no place to live, and they are walking the streets of Toronto today hungry, except for the bowl of hot water with a few vegetables in it which they get at the local missions. I know if any one of these people came to the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) and was hungry, there is no doubt in my mind what the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) would do. There is no doubt in my mind as to what any of the hon. members who sit on the Treasury benches would do. They would give them a couple of dollars to tide them over. But, of course, no one hon. member of the Cabinet, or no single hon. member in this room, is in a position to take care of 4,000 or 5,000 of these people in the city of Toronto, who are hundry.

The hon. member for Hastings East (Mr.Robson), I believe it was, put it very well the other day, when he was discussing the question of subsidies. He said, "I realize this is out of order, but we are told that it is not our baby, but if we go out on the street at night, and see a baby on the doorstep, it may not be our baby, but if we are human beings, we will do something for the baby". I think we stand in very much the same position, as far as these people are concerned. They are here; they are in Ontario; they are hungry; they are suffering from mal-nutrition; many of them will be ill before long, because of that, and the government of Ontario is financially able to do something for these people temporarily, until the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of Ontario has reached an agreement with the federal authorities, as to whose responsibility it is. I say it sounds pretty hollow to have hon. members in this House -- people in the public life of Canada, publicly express

Christian principles on the one hand, and take such a callous, cold-blooded attitude toward hungry men. I do not see how we can take such a Pontius Pilate attitude on this question. Nobody says these people should go hungry; nobody will argue they should be allowed to starve, and yet nobody will accept responsibility for them; they just do what Pontius Pilate did, "wash their hands of the whole business, and say, 'It is the other fellow's responsibility' ".

Now, money is not the problem. We are in a sufficiently sound financial position in this province to give these people temporary relief until somebody does accept responsibility. Had this government done its duty by the people of Ontario and the people of Canada in 1945, there would be no doubt as to whose responsibility it was, because under the social security plan put forward in August, 1945, this was part of the responsibility of the federal government. But the government of Ontario, in its lack of wisdom, did not see fit to accept that arrangement. Now, here, under the shadow of this Parliament Building , you have these thousands of people who are hungry and destitute, and nobody is doing anything for them. We say that unemployment is seasonal. As I said in the city hall last Saturday, "Unemployment may be seasonal, but being hungry is not seasonal; there is not such thing as seasonal hunger."

These people have got to be fed, and I say that the government of Ontario has a moral responsibility to assume that obligation until the two levels of government are able to get together and determine who is responsible, in the long-view of things.

If we continue to just dismiss these people with a cheery smile, and a wave of the hand, and send them on to the next jurisdiction, then I say we have a lot to answer for

and the government of Ontario has a lot to answer for.

I am surprised -- and there is certainly nothing personal about this, nothing personal in it at all -- but I am surprised that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who has much humanity in his make-up, could have found it possible to receive a delegation of these people on three different occasions, and have nothing to say to them but, "Well, it is not our responsibility; and we will not accept it." I do not think we can ever say it is not our responsibility, when we are confronted with a hungry man, or a hungry woman, especially when we are in the financial position to give them the food they need to eat.

MISS AGNESS MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, the stupid part of it is that if these unemployed become ill --if they become mentally or physically ill -- and they are likely to become one or other -- then we assume responsibility.

MR. MILLARD: Or if they commit a crime.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, or if they commit a crime. Then we assume responsibility. Of course, it depends on the crime. It might be federal, and the federal government would assume responsibility.

On the question of health, we do assume the total responsibility, and why can we not do that before they are taken sick, or before they are broken in spirit?

I was thinking about the single unemployed sleeping without blankets. If we could not do anything better, we could buy a few blankets. We will pay in the end, and we will pay far more. It will cost us more in money, and it will cost us tremendously more in the human spirit and human health.

It is now the 29th of March, and should not be very long until it is warmer; surely from now until the sun shines warmly, we could feed and get a few blankets for people who need them, and some coal for their houses.

I felt before, when I was speaking on the Throne Speech, just as strongly as I do today that it is a disgrace to Ontario, unless we assume some responsibility for the unemployed.

I was in Ottawa during all the 30's, and I saw this "run-around" -- the federal government had the money but did not have the power; Ontario had the power, but did not have the money, and the municipalities had to feed them, and they went broke.

We cannot let people die. We have too much Christianity to let them die of starvation, but we have not enough Christianity to make them reasonably temporarily comfortable. I think it is time we did something abou it.

Vote 162 agreed to.

On vote 163.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, before we leave the estimates, I would like to ask a question of the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow). I understand that certain municipalities in Ontario, whenever an old-age pensioner becomes ill and hospitalized, some municipalities will assume the cost for a month or two months. In other municipalities, when an old-age pensioner is hospitalized, the pensioner forfeits his pension chequest for the time being, with the result that when these old-age pensioners are discharged, they are penniless. In view of the fact that this province is subsidizing hospitals, would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) tell us if any arrangement could be made with the hospitals, whereby the old-age pensioners would retain their pension cheques.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand), that that is a policy followed by the hospitals, that while the pensioners are patients in the hospital, the

hospital takes their old-age pension cheques, and when they are discharged, the balance for that month is refundable to them.

MR. CHARTRAND: If they spend a whole month there, they are discharged penniless.

MR. GOODFELLOW: A great many of them spend the remainder of their lives in the hospital, and it is only proper that cheques should go to the hospital.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) what is the reason for having vote 159, "old-age pensions and pensions for the blind", in an amount of $10,475,000. and in vote 163, it is again "old-age pension branch, pensions for the blind, pensions for the old-age pensioners", and the sum is $32,000,000. What is the idea of having these two pension branches separated, and the two amounts shown?

MR. GOODFELLOW: One is the provincial contribution, and the other is a capital grant from the federal government for the 75 per cent of the pension.

Vote 163 agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Department of Planning and Development, vote 128, page 75.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Chairman, speaking on the estimates of the Department of Planning and Development, there are a few things I would like to mention, and I can assure the hon. members that I will not make a very lengthy speech.

However, I would like to point out that the estimates for the Department of Immigration, and also those of Ontario House have been very substantially reduced this year, due to certain curtailments in our immigration activities, both

at Ontario House and in Toronto.

We have eliminated a large amount of what we considered to be duplications of effort by Ontario House in London, and the Dominion authorities at Canada House are looking after certain things which we looked after before, when the Air Scheme was on. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the hon. members.

I would also like to say a word in connection with housing, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make one or two points quite clear.

In the estimates for that department, there is an item of $1,140,000., which is related to housing. This particular item does not, in any sense, represent the monies which the Ontario government will require under this 75 - 25 per cent agreement with the federal government. That item is intended only to supply funds for the general administration of the housing projects, for the completion of existing commitments with municipalities under the old scheme, by which the government assisted municipalities in providing services for housing projects.

It will be obvious to the hon. members that the monies necessary for carrying out the 75 - 25 per cent scheme will be provided on a capital basis, and not in any sense as an ordinary expenditure of the government. It will be equally obvious that it is not possible at this stage to estimate what these requirements will be.

I might say that in the enabling agreement between the two governments which we hope will be signed within the next week or ten days, there is a clause contained therein, at the request of the federal authorities, whereby the financing will be done by the senior partner; in other words, the money will be put up by the senior partner, and

at the end of each year, this government will be billed for its 25 per cent share. That was an agreement which the federal housing people suggested should be contained therein, and I think it is the best thing to have there, because there is no way we can tell exactly what our share will be until the different projects which are undertaken are completed.

On vote 128.

MR. ROSS SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question to the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) under the item of "ministers' salaries". During the Throne debate I made a speech in which I made some suggestions to the honl minister (Mr. Griesinger) in connection with the small business men of the province, and the somewhat serious problems with which they are confronted, and at that time I asked the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) to take into consideration three suggestions I had to make, which I felt would assist the small business man in meeting those problems.

As you will recall, I suggested a retail research and advisory council, and I suggested that they be encouraged to form a co-operative purchasing group in order to meet the mass buying power the chain stores have, and, thirdly, that all rebates and discounts given to chain stores should be published, so that the small retailers would have them available, in connection with their own purchasing.

I have received quite a few letters on that point since I made the speech, all of them in support of the general principle I advanced to you.

What I am interested in finding out is whether you have given that consideration, and whether or not you are prepared to issue some sort of a statement on that general problem.

MR. GRIESINGER: No. I am not at the present time in

a position to make any announcement. I listened with a great deal of interest to your remarks in that regard, and I can assure you we will be only too pleased to give them consideration.

MR. SCOTT: That is what I like to hear you say, that you will take it into consideration. It is a serious problem, and these people have written, and are interested in finding out just what you are prepared to do with regard to this matter.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I had rather hoped the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) remarks would be a little more extended, because we have heard all too little from him since he has occupied his present position.

I think the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) will agree with me that the general impression is that his department was established in lieu of a promise made in 1943 to set up a housing commission in Ontario which would carry through a great slum clearance program, and develop substantial housing projects, which would give employment to large numbers of people.

I think that statement was made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) since this Session began.

Now, the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) will recall that the government of that time made some reather detailed statements on just what the commission was going to do, and when the commission gave a place to the Department of Planning and Development, it was logical we should expect the Department of Planning and Development to carry on where the housing commission never began.

I have here before me a piece of literature issued by the government, in which the people of this province were told that the average wage-earners, under the

government plan could look forward to having a five-room bungalow, of brick or stone construction, with a lawn in front, and a garden in the rear, a central heating system, and three-piece bathroom, telephone, and electric refrigerator, and a garage to house his car, and so on, all for the sum of $3000. payable at ten per cent down, and the balance over a period of 20 years. This will amount to a total of about $25. a month, says the prospectus, and it goes on to say:

"This is not merely an opinion or a tentative proposal; it is an actuality."

That is what tens of thousands of people in this province expected this government to produce, to make that type of home available to the low-wage earners in the province.

Instead of that, the department is only able to report that since this second mortgage plan has been in effect something like 15,000 homes have been built, not by the department, but by private enterprise, and the average purchase price of those homes was not $3000. but $8,000., obviously a figure far beyond 80 per cent of the low-wage earners in the province of Ontario.

Therefore, we cannot but draw the conclusion that the housing problem for some wage earners in the province of Ontario in 1950 is substantially what it was in 1943, if not much worse, because nothing that this government has done has in any way helped these people who are living in the attics and garrets and at Malton, Little Norway, Stanley Barracks, and so on and so forth. They are exactly where they were when we began.

MR. MILLARD: Not exactly in the same place; they are disillusioned now.

MR. Mac LEOD: Yes, they are disillusioned. But they had hopes, especially when they had a beautiful thing like

this flashed before their eyes, with pictures of a little home of brick or stone construction.

Of course, there were some Liberal pamphlets of the same sort, from the federal level, which were just as bad.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pursue that. I want to remind the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) that that is what his government led the people to expect.

What I want to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) is this: has the Department of Planning and Development, which took the place of the housing commission; and which is going to spend a lot of money; they began rather modestly, but it is now getting up into big money -- I think started off with about a half a million dollars, and now it is more than double that -- the Department of Planning and Development, which has a number of branches -- is it your intention to make a housing survey in the province of Ontario? Do you know what the housing needs of the people of this province are? Have you made any survey which would give us in Ontario terms the kind of information which the Curtis Report gave us in nation-wide terms, a few years back? It seems to me that is the kind of information the people of the province ought to have from the government. My impression is that this province is certainly short two or three hundred thousand homes, which are rather desperately needed by the people in the low-range income group. But one must use figures rather generally, unless we have some precise information.

My question, therefore, is; has the Department of Planning and Development made a survey of the housing requirements of the province, and, secondly, if the Department has not done that, would the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) consider making such a survey in the next few months or so?

I do not think it wou d take very long, if we had the co-operation of the municipal councils. So that the hon. members of this Legislature would have some precise information of this kind, and we should know just exactly what the housing needs of the province of Ontario are, both urban and rural. What is your answer?

MR. GRIESINGER: Up to the present time, I have to say, "No. We have not made a survey of that kind, but we are giving it every consideration under the new partnership agreement between the federal authorities and ourselves, and a survey will be made by the Central Mortgage Housing Corporation and ourselves, as to what the housing needs of this provinceare.

Vote 128 agreed to.

On vote 129.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, there is a small item there under the heading of "brokerage". How does the question of brokerage enter into this?

MR. GRIESINGER: "Brokerage, $90."?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

MR. GRIESINGER: We get some maps and drawings from the United States from different planning boards over there, and that is brokerage charges, by the customs brokers.

Vote 129 agreed to.

On vote 130.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, it happens to be in the riding of York West there were two river authorities, the Etobicoke, and the Humber. The subject, therefore, is very close to me and the constituents in West York.

I was greatly encouraged -- I may say even inspired -- in the summer of 1948, very shortly after the election, to receive an invitation, as the member-elect to attend a

meeting of the joint Humber Valley authorities, and the hon. minister of the department, at that time the hon. Dana Porter, attended that meeting, and made some very important announcements. These announcements were clear-cut, no equivocation whatsoever, and on the basis of that announcement which was carried into the press, a copy of which I have here, the Humber Valley authorities proceeded along the lines of the plans prepared in item 5 of vote 130, by the Department of Planning and Development.

The point I want to bring to the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) and to the attention of the government is that there is very little use spending $125,000. to provide services, including aerial surveys , and river gauging, salaries of temporary field staff, living and travelling expenses, equipment and rent, to draw plans only to have those plans thwarted by the government itself. I do not know where the lack of co-ordination or where the lack of authority rests. That is something the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) might acquaint the hon. members of this House with.

But I would like to remind the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) that his predecessor in office, the hon. Mr. Porter, made this very clear-cut statement. The heading in the Toronto Daily Star of Thursday, June 17th, 1948, is as follows:

"Will Double 37½ P.C. Offer for Humber Plan -- Porter". Then the item goes on to say:

> " While federal government experts study the feasibility of provincial flood control plans, Queen's Park will double its original offer of 37½ per cent toward the cost of projects so that municipalities will contribute only 25 per cent. This was announced last night by Hon. Dana Porter,

" minister of planning and development, as the report of the Humber Valley Conservation Authority was made public.

" 'We are prepared to advance a further 37½ percent. over our first 37½ percent., pending the decision of the federal government.' Mr. Porter said. 'Any authority can now be assured of 75 percent. of the costs from one or the other central governments or both'."

Then it goes on to tell about the plans, and the river, and the assistance which was to be given by the government in regard to forestation, and other matters. The subject of conservation has been with us so lately, and a great deal of interest has been expressed through the press, that I would now point out there was an undertaking by the Humber Valley Authority to establish a huge pot to retain the waters, and to stop the run-off, in the freshet season, and the drought season, up at the headwaters of the Humber Valley.

After they had taken options on some thousand acres in that area, as the report called for the provision of recreational facilities for one million persons, living in the vicinity of the watershed, replenishing the wild life, and so forth, -- those were the main concepts of the report. It also provided for an increase in population of pheasants, ruffed grouse, muskrat, deer and other animals, which will follow the creation of woodland areas, and cover patches on the farms; the establishment of a constant flow of wather throughout the summer, and cutting down pollution of water, now caused by dumpting industrial waste and erosion, and this will enable stocks of fish to be built up in the river and its tributaries.

There is no question, Mr. hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that that was a tremendously important undertaking. It was done by voluntary effort, largely. The survey was assisted by the

Department of Planning and Development. The senior officers appeared at the meeting to which I have referred, and explained the aerial survey, the maps and recreational spots, and what was to be done, as the entire scheme developed.

But right at the beginning they had to take up these options, and they came back to this government, which had made this unqualified promise that regardless of what happened at Ottawa this government would pay 75 percent. of that undertaking if the municipalities would undertake to pay the balance of 25 percent.

But when they came back to this government,-- the Humber Valley Authority, appointed by this government, -- the government refused to grant the moneys which they had guaranteed, in these public announcements.

I know that the present hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) was not in his present office at that particular time. There have, in fact, been two changes since that time. But it seems to me if we are going to have anything done about the Conservation Committee's report for this Humber Valley Authority, and these river authorities established by this administration -- if they are going to work; if they are not going to be frustrated; if they are not to be so discouraged and disgruntled that they will give up the ghost -- then the government has no right, less than two years ago, to make a statement of that kind, and then refuse, when put to the test, to "come through" with a promise they had publicly made at that time. What river valley authority is going to proceed, if it does not know what it can depend on when it comes to the final test?

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to state now what is his policy. What can these people depend upon so that they can proceed with some assurance that when they have had their plans approved --this report was approved by the hon Minister at that time; it was o.k'd, and it was publicly

announced that regardless of what the federal government did, 75 percent. would be available when the time came. When the time came, it was not available. I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) what is the present policy. What can these people depend on from here on out?

MR. GRIESINGER: I might say I do not know a great deal about the Humber Valley Authority, because the matter was closed at the time I went into office. But I believe that what the then hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) did was to say that the government would pay 75 percent. of the engineering costs -- that is what I have been told by certain people in the Department. Of course, what you are reading there reads entirely different, and I cannot say whether he made that definite statement or not.

However, the policy of the Department at the present time is that we will pay 37½ percent. of the cost of the works, and the dominion government will pay 37½ percent.

MR. MILLARD: Have they guaranteed that now?

MR. GRIESINGER: No, each case is brought up individually, and in some cases the dominion government has accepted it; in other cases they claim the claiming was not proper. I believe the matter is going to be further discussed at the fall meeting of the Dominion and the Provinces, to see if some definite agreement cannot be arrived at, but the present policy of this department is on a 37½ percent. basis.

(Page EE-19 follows)

MR. MILLARD: I would like to say, in reply to the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) -- and I would like to emphasize it -- that it does not mention "engineering costs". It said:

> "Any authority can not be assured of 75 per cent of the costs from one or the other central government, or both."

It did not restrict it to "engineering costs"; it said that 25 per cent was to be paid by the municipality directly concerned.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the hon. minister's (Mr. Griesinger) attention to the fact that the board of control had already put the amount in their estimates, that we were going to give the Humber Valley authority for the development work in the upper reaches of the Humber River. We had already put it in the estimates. It was there, and would have passed with the rest of the estimates.

At that time, when the province began to waver andw withdrew their support, the board of control in Toronto withdrew their's, too.

While we were discussing this in this House yesterday, the upper reaches of the Humber River was already demonstrating to the province the value of flood control projects, up north of Bolton. While we were discussing this in the House, the flash flood was rushing down on Bolton, and did a great deal of damage.

I think it is too bad, when we get a conservation authority organized, and we get these volunteer workers, working, and when they, on the small budget, had drawn up such an ambitious project, it was a shame to withdraw provincial support,

Votes 130 and 131 agreed to.

On vote 132.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) what Ontario House in London does that Canada House cannot do.

MR. GRIESINGER: I will be very pleased to answer that question. Of course, you appreciate, as all the hon. members do, that when the Air Scheme was on, they did a tremendous amount of work. But from a public relations standpoint, and from an industrial standpoint, I think Ontario House is welll worth the $112,900. in the estimates for this year.

During the past year and a half Ontario House has been responsible for approximately 20 British industries locating in this province, through the effort of their trade and industry branch, and through the efforts of the Agent General, who established contacts amongst industrialists in Britain, and that made all necessary arrangements for them to come to Ontario.

When I was over there, I went through the whole process. The Agent General, for instance, will go to the president of the British board of trade, and to the treasury, in order to get them to allow certain transfers of British funds into Ontario, or into Canada, to help them get their plants started here. I can say honestly that at the present time we are getting any number of enquiries about the possibilities of Ontario, and the possibilities of branch plant location.

Votes 132 and 133 agreed to.

On vote 134.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, all of the hon. members received, with the compliments of hon. Wm. Griesinger, a very nicely -prepared brochure here on the question of

the activities of the trade and industry branch of the Department of Planning and Development. I was impressed with the expansive way in which this was drawn up. We did not seem to be able to get enough money to print Hansard in this province, but for this kind of thing, we can find lots of money to print it. It is very nicely adorned.

I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) what the province did with regard to the asbestos development at Matheson? Here is a company doing business in Canada, and they discover there were asbestos deposits in the vicinity of Matheson, and they decided to locate there, for various reasons. Some people have suggested that they wanted to get away from certain unpalatable conditions in Quebec -- unpalatable to the company.

But I am quite agreed that they want to mine more asbestos, and want more to ship to their markets, because they have not been able to supply them, up to the present time.

I would like to know from the ministry what credit is there due for getting this particular firm located at Matheson?

MR. GRIESINGER: I cannot say definitely in that particular case, what credit --

MR. FROST: Cheap power, good roads, good schools --

MR. NIXON: And good government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh,

MR. GRIESINGER: May I say to the hon. members that we have untold enquiries coming in here from every source, asking for information pertaining to different communities and localities, buildings, and everything else. I may say here that the amount of money we have set aside for trade and industry in this province I sometimes think is very small, when we consider that in the province of Quebec they

have set aside one and one-half million dollars, and today are opening up a Quebec House in London, and another in Paris, France, and I believe they are going down south. Several other provinces are beginning to open up branches, and we are beginning to find out we have a great deal of competition in trying to get plants for the province of Ontario. I will look it up, and see exactly what part we did take in the asbestos deal.

MR. C. M. TAYLOR (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I notice a majority of these industries coming in were established in Toronto or its vicinity. What efforts were used to try and persuade these industries to settle in some of the other areas? I brought this up at the Mines Committee this morning. I think we all agree that mining is a troubled industry, and in a few years we will not have gold mines to work with, but we have good school facilities, and water facilities, and all the other facilities which go to make up a good town. I think some encouragement should be iven by the province to these industries to establish themselves in the mining area.

I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) if plans were ever made to try to get some of these people who settle in Ontario, settled in the north country rather than in "Hog Town" Toronto.

MR. GRIESINGER: We are making some effort to have industry de-centralized -- if you want to call it that. But, according to the reports of the 47 new plants brought into the province of Ontario last year, only 12 located in Toronto! I do not know whether you got a copy of this book; 35 are located in small communities, such as Brockville, Belleville, Burlington, Chatham, and so on. It is a very difficult thing for the trade and industry branch to tell a manufacturer

where he should locate. I appreciate that industry should go up into the north country, if it is at all possible, but the manufacturer must take into consideration so many angles of his business, freight charges, and other costs, that we do not try to deter him from coming in, and if he wants to locate in Toronto, we do not tell him he should not, but should go some place else.

I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) that every effort should be made to induce these people to go to the north country. But, unfortunately, we cannot dictate to a British or American manufacturer who comes in here, as to where he will locate. We will show him from our files the different localities which we think may be suitable for the establishment of his branch plant, but in the final analysis he makes the decision as to where he will locate his plant.

MR. TAYLOR: This may be one good subject for the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) to discuss at Ottawa. You will recall, when the war was on, there was a hue and cry by the federal government that never again must we allow industry to settle in one area.

In view of the fact that we own the railway into this north country, and that we must have business for it, or it will be out of business, I think we should start to do a little planning to get more industry located there, even if we have to subsidize them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) about the new plants located in Toronto. Is it not a fact that they did not locate in Toronto, but in suburban municipalities around Toronto?

MR. GRIESINGER: Yes, I was referring to the Toronto area.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is a little previous. We have not

quite got there yet.

As far as my information goes, these new plants are located notably in the township of Scarborough; I think also in the township of East York, the township of North York, and the township of York, and the like. Speaking as one who represents in this House one of those urban ridings, namely the riding of York South, I would like to say that those in the large centres who take the attitude that we want more and more industries here are, I think, sometimes taking a short-sigted attitude. After all, what they should be concerned about should be whether it is a good community in which to live and to work; not necessarily one that is bursting at the seams, but one which has a well-balanced organization, with adequate services, and with adequate sites for residential property and recreational facilities, as well as for industrial purposes.

(Take FF-1 follows)

Now, I remember verywell, that when Mr. Herbert Morrison was over here three or four years ago, driving around Toronto with him, the first thing he said to me was "you people are making the same mistake thatwe made, your cities are getting too big", and he said, "I would think that you would have enough sense to profit from our mistakes and not centre most of your factories in a big city". And now, that seems to me to be a good comment on what has been happening here. I am of the opinion that too many industries are being centred in the Toronto area. If I thought that were good for that area, perhaps I might feel it was my duty to encourage, but I feel it isnot good for this area, and many of the acute problems which have arisen inthe city of Toronto area in recent years are due to this over-concentration. I notice many of the new plants in Scarborough township, for instance, are very small plants. They havenot even a railroad siding. Some of them are located on a road, no railraod siding. Their small plants, and their small products will go out entirely by road transport, and their materials come in by road transport.

In a case like that, I cannot for the life of me see why it is necessary to locate at or near Toronto, and I can think of a good many places where the small industry would be located in the smaller centres. I agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that he must make that decision, and he makes that decision in the light of a good many considerations, there has to be the costs, the accessibility of his material, and so on, but if his plant is to be located on a road rather than on a railroad, it does not make a great deal of difference whether he is in Scarborough Township or at Brampton or some place of that kind, where there are residential facilities available, and where a small plant could very well be located.

I sometimes suspect that some of these plants are located in large centres, not so much for these reasons, but because some of the directors have a good many interests in different companies, and they like to have the plant close-by, easily accessible.

I think one of the responsibilities of the hon. Minister's department (Mr. Griesinger) is to check and take a very active interest in this matter, and try to avoid further over-centralization or over-concentration in these areas.

At the moment, in the United States there is a very big movement going on for concentrating their factories for defence purposes. Well, that is an impossible situation. They have already got so many plants in areas like Pittsburgh and Detroit, it is unthinkable to start re-locating them or re-building them at other centres. We might have the opportunity now to avoid some of the mistakes being made by the British and Americans in the past. I do not say we can do it in every case, but I do think we could do more with the smaller plants, and that is pretty well true now, when we know that the concentration of th se industries in certain plants create problems for the government.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in an earlier debate, referred to the fact that the coming of these new industries provides new problems. These problems are costing taxpayers money. Surely they should give you a voice in the location of these factories, becauss when they come here, they are going to call on you for services. They are not always conferring a favour on you by building a new plant here. With the advantages there come disadvantages as well, and the problems you now face of a Toronto metropolitan area, or something of that kind, is largely due to this functional industrial growth concentrated in the Toronto area. I suppose before very long, if this goés on, you will have the same problem in Hamilton,

and perhaps in Windsor and who knows, in London. Industry seems to be moving towards London, if they get the water, which I doubt. But anyway, they are trying to move on to London and Chatham. Chatham has probably grown more than other place of its size in the country.

With all these problems before you, I think you are entitled to exercise a stronger voice in the location of new industries, and I cannot believe many of them could not have located themselves better, from an economic point of view, in the smaller centres.

MISS MACPHAIL: Mr.Chairman, since I represent York East, I want to draw the hon. Minister's attention (Mr. Griesinger) to the fact that the Reeve of Scarborough claims more industries than were mentioned by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger). I must put the hon. Leader of our party (Mr. Jolliffe) right, when he says the industries in Scarborough are small industries. I could not let that go.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I said"some of them".

MISS MACPHAIL: They have a spur of the railroad, because they are very proud of it, and are going to have two spurs. The fair name of Scarborough must be upheld.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That means they will have more crossings to worry about.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I realize every one has reached the point where they want to go home, but I want to ask a question. Is it not part of Major Armstrong's responsibility to seek a market for Ontario's goods, agricultural and otherwise? I may say, before I pursue the question a bit, that I am one of those who strongly favour the retention of Ontario House. I think it is performing a real service to this province, and I cannot speak too warmly of Major Armstrong, in the work he was doing when I was in England a year or so ago. I think he

is a very good representative of this province, I think he has made a fine contribution to the province in the work he has done over there.

It seems to me, in view of what is being said, since the Session began, that there is another special task that he might add to the things which he is now doing, and that is to look around the continent of Europe for trade possibilities for this province.

I think he would be an admirable person to go to the European countries, the Scandinavian countries, and see if he cannot open up trade possibilities for this province. I was thinking if he began some preliminary work along these lines, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), -- if he will listen to me for a moment -- if Major Armstrong made some preliminary exploration in this field, that he might pave the way for a visit to Europe by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of Ontario, after he has rested up a bit from the Session, and he might go and confer with some of the governments on the other side of the water, about the possibilities of finding a market for Ontario agricultural products, as well as the things which we are turning out of our mills and factories. I think we cannot wait for Mr. Gardiner to solve some of these trade problems for us.

I do not think there is anything in the Constitution of the country that rules out the possibility of having our own trade commissioner working out from Ontario House in London, to tour the eastern European countries, the Scandinavian countries, and go as far east as you can go.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Jugo-Slavia?

MR. MacLEOD: Jugo-Slavia, as far as you want to go. We will send you to China.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you want me to go there and not come back?

MR. MacLEOD: You would not be drafted in the Army. But, if Major Armstrong can do something --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think if he will do as good a job for the province in drumming up trade, as he did for the government in drumming up Tory candidates, he will have done a lot for us.

MR. MacLEOD: He might have done that; I only judged him by what I saw when I was there, and I thought, by and large, he was doing a pretty good job. I might be wrong, I may be off the beam.

MR. MILLARD: Do you think he was justified in putting out that pamphlet?

MR. MacLEOD: No, that was put out by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and I were at the banquet where this was born, this "New World" that the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) is talking about.

He may have committed a few sins, but he is a good representative for Ontario, and if he can add to the work by seeking out markets for the surplus which we produce in this province, I think it would be a very excellent function for him to take on, and I would like to get the -- apparently, you cannot get much reaction over there now; they are in conference -- you are not even listening.

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, I am.

MR. FROST: Just discussing some point you raised.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you not think that is a good idea for Major Armstrong, or you could be John the Baptist and start spreading the Gospel of Ontario.

MR. FROST: It keeps me so busy looking after you fellows here, without getting outside. I think I will stay around here.

MR. MacLEOD: If you go over there, and find markets for

some tens of millions of dollars worth of Ontario products, I think all of us on this side of the House will give you an undertaking we will do nothing to distrub the things while you are away.. You would be a good ambassador of good-will. Perhaps you would learn things over there, so you could tell them something at Ottawa next August.

MR. GRIESINGER: A good deal of work is being done for Ontario's manufactured products, but I regret to say we cannot sell Ontario's food products, because that is tied up with the dominion government. They make the food deals, and that is the end of it.

MR. MacLEOD: Surely something could be done with the affection which has sprung up lately between the hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent) and the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost).

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, may I say I do not recall being midwife at the birth of the pamphlet.

MR. MacLEOD: You were there when the heart of the "New World" came out. I sat alongside of you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not recall it, but I will say this, that if Ontario House can bring more business to this province, I am all for it. I might say I havenot heard, during the last two or three years, the criticism of Ontario House which we all heard during the first years of its work, and I therefore assume there has been considerable improvement. I might also say this, that while I do not favour the setting up of embassies and legations for this province in foreign lands, I think that this province has to go out and look for business. I agree with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) there. As a matter of fact, under the Estimates of another Department, I am going to suggest the opening of another office purely for drumming up business in another capital. I will deal with that when we come

to it. I think we have to go out of our way to cultivate and maintain these foreign contacts that we have, and I think there is a place for Ontario. After all, we cannot expect the representatives of the dominion government to sing the praises of Ontario, and its products, at the expense of nine other provinces. That would be expecting a little too much, and I therefore think there is a place for Ontario.

MR. DENNISON: Before the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) becomes too enthusiastic about the ability of this gentleman to sell Ontario farm products in Europe, I would like to point out to him and to the hon. members of the House, that the United States Senate, in giving Marshall aid this year, are, unfortunately, insisting on one billion dollars of that Marshall aid shall be of their surplus farm products. Now, that will undoubtedly affect the prices that will have to be received all through Europe, and makes the whole problem a very difficult one.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, arising out of this, there is one thing I want to say, and it is how pleased I am and how relieved I am that "Old Man Ontario" is back in the House.

MR. MILLARD: I do not know what the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) or the government can do, but I might point out it was announced that a 15 percent. tariff has been put on tin plate coming from Britain. Now, it seems to me that that is a very great lack of planning, and there ought to be immediate consultation between provincial and federal authorities in regard to this matter.

MR. FROST: I thought it was taken off.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, it is on again.

MR. MILLARD: No, it was off, and they are going to put a 15 percent. tariff on. Now, we are using more and more tin plate, and there is not a surplus of tin plate either in Canada or the United States, and it seems to me if we want Britain

as the hon. members have suggested, to buy from us, that we ought to be buying from them at least those things which we are getting from the United States and paying for in American dollars.

It seems to me that some consultation ought to take place between the governments immediately, on a question such as this, because it affects all of Canada, and it affects Ontario particularly, because the steel industry, so far as tin plate is concerned, is all located in Ontario, and we have to import great quantities of tin plate from the United States.

I certainly think that here is one place where the British market ought to be encouraged to work with us in an exchange proposition, if nothing more, so I hope the government will take that matter under consideration, and deal with Ottawa as expeditiously as possible.

Vote 134 agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Thursday, in going over the Order Paper with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I indicated that we would try to clean up the Order Paper, government Orders 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 46. Now, I was talking to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) tonight, and he is feeling better today, his temperature is down, but he felt that perhaps he should not sit here one of these long eight-hour days, from two O'clock on. He thought perhaps he could sit for an hour or two in the afternoon, which would enable us to take

care of these items. I would then call Agriculture, and also the resolution of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) which has to do with Hydro, because that follows. There is an item in the Department of Agriculture Estimates, dealing with Hydro. We will follow that with the Department of Health, the Department of Labour, Department of Travel and Publicity.

I know that is quite an order, but that would leave us with Friday, which is the 31st of March, the end of the fiscal year, with the Estimates of the Department of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), Department of Education, Department of Insurance, Department of the Provincial Secretary, and the Department of Reform Institutions.

Now, I do not like to work the hon. members too hard, but on Friday, we could meet at 10 o'clock in the morning, and sit till one, and then from two o'clock till 4:30. Perhaps we could complete that order.

That would leave us, Mr. Speaker, with the Labour Bill. I had hoped to call that Bill before this, but because of the illness of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), I have held it this week.. Then, we have the Budget Debate, and I am very anxious to hear the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod).

MR. MacLEOD: It sounds like it.

MR. FROST: We then have four or five days, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and we will be sitting mornings and evening, but I will get the Budget Debate on next week. Then, there are the balance of these Bills, Orders 51 to 54 inclusive, which I do not imagine will be very lengthy.

They arise out of the Budget Debate. Then, come private members' Bills, which I had hoped to be called completely in that period of time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is about the situation at the moment.

I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns the present sitting, that it do stand adjounred until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule Two of the Assembly be suspended so far as it might apply to this motion.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, it is not for me, I suppose, to complain about any agreements that are made between the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. JOLLIFFE: There are no agreements between the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and I.

MR. MacLEOD: Do not be touchy. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) began his remarks by saying that he had discussed plans with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and I do not see why the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) should be so touchy because I mentioned that fact.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not touchy; there just is not any agreement, so do not mention it.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, there appears to be no disagreement.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The hon. member opposite (Mr. Jolliffe) is the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it only seems courteous that I would tell him what I had in mind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It would not be correct to say there was agreement or disagreement.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, we can agree that the situation is fluent.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: It is flexible.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is a very good arrangement. Perhaps hon. members have forgotten there was a budget introduced in the House on the 17th of

March, and the main criticism of that Budget was made by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer), followed by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown), and while I realize I am the minority of the minority tonight, having been deserted by my party, unfortunately, I do not think I should be so summarily dismissed as a participant in the Budget Debste. I happen to be the only hon. member of the House who shares the distinction claimed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) himself on Budget day, in that I am the only member in this House, who, if the opportunity ever arises during this Session, will make the eighth consecutive contribution to the motion before us.

Having regards to procedure that has been adopted for some years now, I do not think I should have been just tossed aside like that, because if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) is going to rush through these Estimates in the next day or two, then I suggest anything that is said on the Budget is very much by way of anti-climax. I think at least all groups in the House should have an opportunity to make one contribution to the Budget Debate before the Estimates are disposed of. I have been pressed out up to now. I assumed when I adjourned the Debate, that I would be permitted to resume the Debate yesterday or Monday, but now I am going to be squeezed into the dying hours of the dying days, and I do not think that is in keeping with the usual courtesy that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) extends to hon. members of this House.

MR. FROST: Well, Mr.Speaker, I might say that I have not wanted to "squeeze"the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) out of his "place in the sun", I can assure him that is not the case. In Ottawa this year, they, as you know, are considering Estimates, and the Estimates there probably will be considered and voted before the Budget Address is over. Now, I might

say this to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that I do not think the consideration of the Estimates, as such, will affect the Budget Speech for this reason, that references in the Budget Speech are not of course to particular items in the Estimates, but they are more on matters of government policy, on our position dealing with the matter of the total of our Budget and matters of that sort.

Now, the procedure will be this: if we complete the Estimates here on Friday, the motion ways and means will not take place until the Budget itself is adopted. I had intended to do this, and I had hoped that this would meet with the hon. member's (Mr. MacLeod) views. I had hoped we would take the Labour Bill on Monday. If there is any time left over on Monday evening, after the Debate on that issue, I would fill in the time with the hon. members' Bills, and I would then allow time for the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) to speak on the opening of the House at two o'clock on Tuesday. I would hope we would be able to have the division on the Budget on Tuesday sometime, I should think, there would not be so very many to speak on the Budget. The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) could continue the Debate that afternoon, and it would be closed by someone on the government side of the House. I think perhaps that would be better than to adjourn the Estimates. We would like to have the Estimates through by the end of the month, the end of the fiscal year, if possible. I know it is not altogether a necessity, but it is very desirable. I think that might work into the situation very satisfactorily.

There will, of course, be a reply from the government side of the various criticisms that have been levelled at the government, in connection with the Budget, but I hope we shall be able to have the vote on Tuesday.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)? I have been here quite a few years. Is there any reason why with the increasing amount of work that is before this Legislature, we should have to put off the opening until some six weeks before Good Friday? Every year it is the same, and tempers become frayed and then some casualties take place in this House as a result.

We had difficulty last year, and apparently may have difficulty this year. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if consideration can not be given to calling this House one or two weeks earlier, to give us time to do the job and do it properly. It seems to me that the hon. members can afford to take the necessary time to give proper consideration to work and the problems, as it is becoming more complicated for us, and it is becoming more complicated for the government. Some of us have very large ridings, and a great many of us have not been able to take up important matters in the Throne Speech Debate, which we think are very important, and the Budget Debate, which is a public debate on public policy. Matters of that kind are being crammed into a very small space of time.

I would like to know if the government would agree to the proposition of either deciding to sit after Easter, or calling the Session at least one or two weeks earlier?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I might say I have discussed that with some of the hon. members there, some of the hon. members on our side, and as you know I did call the Session a week earlier than the usual traditional time, and certainly I realize that we have not wasted any time this Session. The fact is, we started in to work the very day the Session was called, and we have been very dilligent, we have put in long hours. I realize that it takes all of our time to get through

the business of the House, and this year, it is going to be strenuous to do it.

I most certainly will give consideration to the point the hon. member (Mr. Millard) raised.

I might say to the hon. members of the House, that the people of the province just do not recognize what I am going to mention. I recognize that the hon. members of this House, in representing the ridings in these days are faced with very heavy duties.

(Take GG-1 follows)

After all, the expenses of an hon. member is not confined to his being here in this Legislature. It is a 365 day per year job. The hon. members of this House have to look after a great multiplicity of things, old-age pensions, roads, bridges, educational matters, and a host of things, which takes their time, and are an expense to them. They have, in most cases, to employ secretarial assistance, and so on. I recognize that the hon. members from outside Toronto are faced with heavy expenses while in Toronto --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: -- and anything I have been able to do to reduce the length of the Session and save expense to them, I have felt disposed to do. I think all the hon. members understand that. We have not wasted any time in this Session; we have taken up every bit of our time with the government business, and we have tried to organize so that could be done. I realize if we wanted to call the Session two or three weeks earlier, that could very easily be done, but as far as my colleagues and myself are concerned, we try to recognize the problems of the private hon. members who have tremendous expenses, and in addition have great expense in living here in Toronto, for which there is absolutely no allowance.

MR. MILLARD: Give the out-of-town hon. members another $1,000.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: That seems to strike a very popular note.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, and when the House adjourns its present sittings thereof, it stands adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provision of Rule No. 2 of the Assembly be suspended as far as it may apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:34 of the clock, p.m.

- - - - - -

Volume 31

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS THIRTIETH DAY OF MARCH, A.D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P.M.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 30, 1950.
2:00 o'clock, p.m.

- - - - - -

2:00 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports By Committees.

MR. J. D. McPHEE (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Law and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

To the hon. the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Municipal law begs leave to present the following as their First and Final Report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 102 - An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 112 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) J. D. McPhee,
Chairman.

Report agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introductions of Bills.

THE SANATORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT, 1949.

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act, 1949".

and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr.Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Public Hospitals Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE SILICOSIS ACT

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Silicosis Act, 1950", and that same be now read a first time.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Would the hon. Minister give an explanation?

MR. GOODFELLOW: The purpose of this Bill is to control the hazard to health involved in silica exposure in industrial operations other than mining, and it provides that any employee engaged in any occupation involving a silica exposure may be required to take a medical examination at any time.

I think it was very well set out and explained in the Act. It is to control the possible hazard to health in certain industrial processes involving exposure to silica materials. The Bill will authorize periodical medical examination and medical supervision of workers engaged in industrial processes involving silica exposure.

The scheme of the Act follows similar legislation introduced into the Mining Act some years ago.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act", and that same be now read a first time.

This Bill deals with matters involving cases where there are tax arrears, and tax arrears certainly cannot be registered until taxes are in arrears for one year, or in arrears for two years in the case of vacant land, and so on.

This amendment is to provide for a certificate showing the amount of unpaid taxes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

SCHOOL LAW AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The School Law Amendment Act, 1950", and that same be now read a first time.

This is the School Law Amendment Act which is commonly passed in the Session to deal with certain points that have to be taken care of in a number of school communities. There are a number of sections that can be dealt with when the Bill comes up for second reading.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE VOTERS LISTS ACT

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr.Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Voters Lists Act", and that same be now read a first time.

This is a minoramendment, which brings the Voters Lists Act in line with the Assessment Act. The amendment is of a minor character, and not fundamental to the rights of citizens.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) prepared to give the House a statement of his general position on this question of --

MR. PORTER: I simply introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

THE BUSINESS RECORDS PROTECTION ACT

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Business Records Protection Act, 1947", and that same be now read a first time.

Instead of repealing the Act, as we had planned to do, we now propose to amend it, so that it will remain generally applicable but will also provide that where any company is registered in the field of security under some authority outside of Ontario, the Act will not apply.

I think in view of certain activities that appear to be taking place in Washington, it might be as well to have such protection.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): You have to be told more than once.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think that covers all the Bills for which notice has been given, with the exception of the Statute Law Amendment Act, which will be considered by the Standing Committee.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Are you dropping the Securities Act?

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): There are some proposed amendments to that Act. I am not prepared to proceed; whether or not I will at Committee I cannot say.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I table answers to questions 64, 68 and 111.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Why can we not have an answer to No. 9?

MR. FROST: I sent out instructions to have all these answers prepared. To date, I understand that there are 111 questions, and I think of the 111 questions, about 70 have been taken care of, and some withdrawn, and some will be answered by order for return.

Yesterday I sent a directive to all the Departments to get these answers in.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

THE BUSINESS RECORDS PROTECTION ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 95, "An Act to repeal The Business Records Protection Act, 1947", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be discharged, and the Bill be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

Bill No. 95 withdrawn.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950", Mr. Welsh.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): My recollection is that the third reading of this Bill was called 1, and my hon. friend for High Park (Mr. Temple) moved an amendment and the matter was left over, and I presume it is ready for a vote.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): No, I do not think the hon. member for High Park (Mr.Temple) moved an amendment. It may have been an immature thought, but I do not think he moved it.

MR. FROST: I know the amendment he had in mind, and it had no relation to the Bill. It is not the custom to have debate on third reading, and if the hon. member moves an amendment on third reading, it may be against the rules. The amendment is not acceptable to the government, but I will call this Bill in order that the hon. member (Mr.Temple) may have his say, and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) maymake his reply. It may be more satisfactory than having to vote without any discussion on the issues.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Actually I have explained the purpose of this amendment but did not consent to debate it; merely to presentit, and I would like the House to make a decision on it. I would like to move this amendment.

It still has not been moved.

MR. FROST: If you prefer it that way.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Yes. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 87, "The Marriage Act, 1950".

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Just before there is any question about this Bill, may I add this historical foot-note?

I think the House would be interested to know this is not the first time a civil marriage bill has been considered in this province, [illegible]

In 1841, the denomination known as "Bible Christians" petitioned the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada for authority to be given their ministers to solemnize marriages. The Assembly considered the petition, and passed a

Bill "to enable the Ministers of all Denominations of Christians to solemnize marriage, under certain restrictions".

After having passed third reading by the Assembly, the Bill was sent to the Upper House, the Legislative Council, where it was amended by striking out everything after the first word, "whereas", and inserting instead a new Bill which would have authorized County Registrars to solemnize a marriage which could later be blessed by a minister of any denomination if the parties wished it.

That was introducing the first civil marriage bill, 109 years ago.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Was there any reference to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) at that time?

MR. JOLLIFFE: He must have been a freshman 109 years ago.

This was Ontario's first civil marriage bill. It was passed by the Legislative Council, but was defeated by the Assembly by the expedient of failing to report it out of the Committee of the Whole.

The marriage ceremony provided for, required each of the parties to make the following declaration: "I do solemnly declare, that I do not know of any lawful impediment why I, A.B., may not be joined in matrimony to C.D.", and each of the parties shall thereupon say to the other: "I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, A.B., do take thee, C.D., to be my wedded wife" -- or husband, as the case may be.

This is exactly the same form, word for word, as is provided for in the 1950 Act.

That was 109 years ago, and the marriage ceremony provided for is the same without the deletion of a comma or the the insertion of a period, and there has been nothing added

to or taken away from the wording of 1841.

MR. FROST: It has taken 109 years to explain the purposes of that Bill of 1841. I suggest that the hon. members of the Opposition should not be discouraged about their Bills.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TEMPLE: I am a little discouraged about this, in spite of those words.

Mr.Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dennison, that the motion now before the House be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that", and substituting therefor the following:

> Bill No. 87, The Marriage Act, 1950, be not now read a third time but be forthwith recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the Bill by adding thereto provisions which will require persons contemplating marriage to show that their blood has been tested for syphilis and that the result of such test has been made known to both parties to the intended marriage.

Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this amendment, and I will not take up the time of the House further. I would like to see the House accept it, but I am a little discouraged, and would appreciate a statement from the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh).

MR. SPEAKER: There is no debate on the amendment, I believe. The principle is not debated on third reading.

The amendment negatived on division.

Ayes	18
Nays	57

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa", Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr.Speaker, in the absence of Mr.Chartrand, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 21, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

CITY OF KINGSTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston", Mr. Stewart.

MR. H. A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 32, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the Act.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE K.V.P. COMPANY LIMITED.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting The K.V.P. Company Limited", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 117, "An Act respecting the

K.V.P. Company Limited".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE PLANNING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Planning Act, 1946", Mr. Griesinger.

Hon. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr.Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to amend The Planning Act, 1946".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order, third reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948", Mr.Frost.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

(Take B-1 follows)

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 20.

PROFESSION OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to regulate the profession of Public Accountancy in Ontario", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 129, "An Act to regulate the profession of Public Accountancy in Ontario".

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, unless the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) intends to make any remark --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us hear the hon. minister (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: No doubt any remarks I would make would not answer the question the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) proposes to ask. It never has yet. Perhaps you had better ask the question first.

MR. SALSBERG: In view of the physical condition of the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) I do not want to aggravate him now, and I will postpone my question until after he has made his statement.

MR. PORTER: I explained this Bill very fully on first reading. It is a Bill to regulate the profession of public accountancy in Ontario. There are now a number of well-recognized organizations of public accountants in Ontario which to a certain extent -- a considerable extent -- regulate their own activities. There are, however, a number of independent accounts in Ontario who are not connected with any of these associations, and are under no regulations at all. This Bill provides for a council to be set up which will be appointed, to some extent, by the existing organizations, and some members of the council will be elected by other

licensed public accountants at large. As far as it is practicable, there will be an opportunity for reasonable representation for all concerned.

The main purpose of the Bill is, after the passing of this legislation -- after the date provided in the Bill -- no person shall be able to carry on as a public accountant, and represent to the public that he is qualified to do the work of public accountancy, for the members of the public, unless he is licensed under this Bill.

At the present time, there are a number of people who are carrying on very satisfactorily; people with high reputations, carrying on the business of public accountancy without any definite academic qualifications of any kind, in some cases. They will all be entitled to be included, under this Bill, and to obtain licenses without any further examination or further qualifications.

That is the general principle behind the Bill. It has been very carefully worked out over the last year, after consultation with all the bodies of accountants concerned, and has been viewed from the point of view of education. One of the chief officers in the Department of Education has carried on the negotiations which have led to this Bill.

I think that is all I need to say at the moment as to the general explanation of it.

Now, if the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has any question after that -- which would be a great surprise to me -- I would be delighted to try and understand the question, and if I understand it, to answer it.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, it shows that the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) has not changed during the last few days, even though he was away from the House. He still

provokes a little -- and unnecessarily.

MR. PORTER: Do not feel too badly about it.

MR. SALSBERG: What I wanted to bring to the House at this time is the request of a group of public accountants who are very eager that every opportunity for continuing the practice of that profession will not be impaired. I have no quarrel with the principle of the Bill, nor with any effort to improve the standards of that important profession.

Perhaps other hon. members have been approached by that group. I have. I think if any group of any profession feels they want their problems brought before the House, we should do so.

This is a group of public accountants who have formed themselves recently into an association in this city, and they are extremely anxious to secure assurance that they will be given licenses.

I know the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) in his remarks, implied that will be done. However, I did want to have it specifically answered on behalf of these people, that those who are now practising will be given a license to continue to practise. They also they ask they be given an opportunity to be represented on the over-all board which will be set up. Whether that is possible or not, is something which the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) may be able to answer.

These are people who devote their full time to the profession. They are evidently satisfactory to the firms and individuals for whom they work, and are fulfilling a useful task, and they not only want to be assured that they will be able to continue, but also be given a place on the licensing board.

That is something about which I would like to hear from the hon. minister (Mr. Porter). Will they be given the

opportunity?

MR. PORTER: If you would name this association. I do not know whether this is association has made any representations or not.

MR. SALSBERG: The name is the"Public Accountants Association of Ontario,"and I see from their letterhead, it says:

> "A body recently formed to protect the interests of all practising public accountants in the province of Ontario, who are not affiliated with either the Chartered Accountants Association, or the Certified Public Accountants Association".

MR. PORTER: The fact that they are not connected with the Chartered Accountants or Certified Public Accountants does not bar any of them from practising public accountancy in Ontario, nor from coming in under this Act, as of today.

MR. SALSBERG: Will they be given licenses?

MR. PORTER: Yes, if they are bona fide public accountants. I think they are expected to have been in practice for some number of months -- I cannot recall exactly what the provision is. But it does not matter to what organization they belong, or whether they are members of any organization at all. There are a good many independents to-day who do not belong to any of these organizations, who will have the benefits of this Act.

If this organization has any representations to make, or wishes to discuss its position in the matter, of course, they should do so immediately, because discussions have been going on for a year with all known organizations.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, just in reply to the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) may I say that what I was quoting from

was a copy of a memorandum sent to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) on March 27th. It is possible that because of the illness of the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) he did not see the memorandum but which will be found in his office.

MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that the King's business always goes on. I might not have been in the office, but somebody else no doubt has brought that to the attention of the proper official. I am informed this has been laid before Mr. Beatty, the director of Vocational Education, who was working on this Bill, and I presume he has been in touch with them, or has had the matter under consideration.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25. Mr. Speaker, I am not calling Orders 21 to 24 inclusive, in order that the Budget debate may precede the consideration of these particular Bills.

Order No. 25.

ALTERATION OF THE LIMITS OF THE PROVINCE

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order, second reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to express the consent of the Legislature of Ontario to an Alteration of the Limits of the Province", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 136, "An Act to express the consent of the Legislature of Ontario to an Alteration of the Limits of the Province".

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): How many acres are we gaining out of this?

MR. SCOTT: Two hundred odd, I think it is, according to memory.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order, second reading of Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act", Mr. Daley.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 137,

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) like to say anything about it?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to; the House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. L.M.FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, House in Committee on section 1, Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1947", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, this section, number one, which is under discussion, is the section which we deferred, and it is necessary to correct a glaring anomaly in the 1947 Act.

That Act provides that where an employee has sufficient years of service he is entitled to a superannuation allowance. There are hundreds of civil servants so entitled, e.g., employees with twenty-five years of service who are between the ages of 60 and 70. Should these employees die leaving

no widow or children their estates receive only the individual's contributions with interest. That has been a principle of the Act since it was passed thirty years ago. The 1947 Act did not alter that principle.

In 1947 the government wished to make some provision for those civil servants who reached retirement age without earning an allowance. Section 25 of the 1947 Act was therefore passed and it also provided, "Where an employee ..... dies before he is entitled to a superannuation allowance, twice the amount of his contributions" shall be payable to his estate. This provision, where death occurred, has been found to be unsound. Why should the estate of an employee with insufficient service to earn an allowance receive a double refund and the estate of the employee with longer service receive a single refund? It just does not make sense.

Since it was passed thirty years ago, a basic principle of the Act has been the provision of protection to widows and children of employees who had sufficient service to earn that protection. The present amendment merely continues that basic principle -- a principle which was departed from in the 1947 Act, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has quite correctly pointed out. There is no reason, however, why we should not retrace a step which has been found to be unwise.

The 1947 Act provided a double refund in all cases of death or retirement where an allowance was not earned. This provision, as mentioned above, originated with the government. The Civil Service Association was not consulted as it was naturally assumed it would be in favour of this new generous provision. The Civil Service Commission registered opposition to the 1947 provision. This opposition was based on the fact that the main body of those who would benefit would

be those who could not complete fifteen years of service before reaching the age of sixty-five, i.e., those appointed after they had reached the age of fifty years. The Commission felt this would lead to increased pressure for appointment from applicants over fifty years of age, and because of the large number of that age category already in the service, it was desirable to recruit younger applicants to take the place of those who would be retiring.

The present amendment is actually very limited in its scope. It does not affect anyone who reaches retirement age. It affects only that small proportion of employees who die in the service before they have served ten years. If they die after ten years' service their widows and children are provided for under the other sections of the Act. For those who die a double refund is provided if they leave a widow or children. In the few remaining cases the estate will receive a refund, with interest, of the employee's contributions.

The Opposition has advanced the argument that dependents of employees other than widows or children should receive protection. There is, of course, some merit in that argument but it would involve a considerable re-casting of the Act. It is true that the 1947 Act inadvertently did provide some protection for dependents who might benefit from the double refund, but it also created very unfair discrimination for long service employees.

I had a case like that come across my desk since this matter was discussed in the House. An employee of the Department of Agriculture, who retired on February 22nd, of this year, died on March 9th. A requisition was issued the other day for the payment to his estate of $1,714., which represented

his his contribution to the superannuation fund, with interest less $19. paid to him as a superannuation allowance for the part of the month of February. If this man had remained in the Service a few days longer until he died, and had not been receiving the allowance, the Superannuation fund would have had to pay his estate $3,422. This man had no dependents whatever, and it is to correct situations of this kind, that this amendment is introduced.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) undertook to get certain information for me, at an earlier stage. I am not clear, from what he said today, whether the Civil Service Association was consulted in connection with this amendment. I understood him to say it was not consulted in connection with the 1947 amendment. What is the answer, in respect to this particular amendment?

MR. WELSH: The Civil Service Association officials have not been consulted regarding this amendment, because they have not held a meeting, but we have discussed it with the president and other officials, and they are quite happy about it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I also asked the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) to tell us just how many cases of difficulty, such as he described, had arisen since 1947, and how much money was involved. He has not given us that information today.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, we have had a totl of 83 of those cases. Refunds have been made in the case of the death of males, which numbered 69; 21 refunds were made to widows, 34 refunds were made to estates, and 1 to children. In the case of females; there were 14 cases; 13 refunds were made to their estates, and 1 to themselves. That makes a total of 83. Widows 21, estates 47, children 1.

This may sound misleading, because in some of these cases the refunds made to estates went to children who were being taken care of by will, and that amounted to a total of $48,361 paid to estates.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That answer may be clear to other hon. members of the House, but it is not clear to me. The hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) presented this amendment on the basis that since 1947 some serious anomalies had arisen, that is to say, you found yourselves paying money to an estate, where there is actually no dependent, and where it seemed unjust and unnecessary that an estate of a deceased servant, who did not actually have any dependents, such as a widow or a child, should be assisted in that way.

(Page B-11 follows)

That is the kind of anomaly about which we wanted further information, and it does not appear from what the minister has just given us. He gave us a rigamarole of males and females and widows, without making it clear how many anomalies there have been, and how much money was involved in the anomalies. That is what we want to know. I think that should be clear enough. What does the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) say about that.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) has given a very clear statement of the matter, since the question was raised-- and properly raised-- by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and other hon. members of the Opposition. The whole matter has been checked into, and has been gone into very carefully with Mr. Foster, the Civil Service Commissioner, from whom the request for the Bill really emanated. The Cabinet has considered it, and it has been discussed with the officers of the Civil Service Association, and they all feel that this is a proper and just amendment.

All of us here want to be generous in connection with our superannuation provisions. I think the Amendment of 1947 went a long ways beyond what had previously been the case. The principle of doubling the interest, on contributions to the fund, was an important matter of the Bill that was in itself a most unusual thing, and it is something which we thought was generous and proper.

This is one of those peculiar kinks which creep into a thing of this kind, and I can assure the hon. member the

leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the whole thing was looked over by the Cabinet, and those who handle the Superannuation Fund, and we have no hesitation in recommending the amendment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) should be able to appreciate the difficulty. He knows the reasons given in support of this amendment. Now, the question which arose is this; in how many cases, since 1947, has it been necessary to make payments to an estate where there is no widow, no child, no other dependent involved, and how much money was represented in those cases?

Some of us here are particularly interested in this matter. An employee might die before being entitled to a superannuation allowance, leaving a dependent, but has no widow or child. That is the real crux of the matter, and the basis of any objection I have raised. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) please answer this question:

(a) The number of cases in which it was necessary to make payments, where there was a dependent other than a widow or child involved, and

(b) Where there was a case where it was necessary to make payments under section 25 of the 1947 Act, where there were neither widow, child, nor any other dependents.

That would reveal the extent of the alleged anomalies. That has not been explained to us here. Perhaps the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) will understand the nature of my inquiry, too. I thought it was quite clear.

MR. WELSH: In reply to the question by the hon.

leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) where the figures show, as they were worked out, that there were $24,000 paid to estates under the old Act, where there was no dependent. The Superannuation Fund paid out $24,000 more than it was ever intended they should do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is since 1947?

MR. WELSH: Yes. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) must realize that at the time at our disposal and at the disposal of the Civil Service Commission, to check the whole thing would be extremely difficult, as we would have to examine into the whole fund.

MR. JOLLIFFE; I assumed you knew all about it or you would not have undertaken to introduce this amendment.

MR. WELSH: What I was interested in was the cases where we paid out $24,000, when there was no dependent.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I can understand the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) on that. Let me say what I am interested in. I am interested in how much was paid out, and in how many cases, where the beneficiaries were dependents other than the widow or child, because they are the people who are being cut out by this amendment, and we should know to what extent they are effected, as far as the three year period is concerned.

MR. WELSH: I cannot understand the question by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in that respect, because they are not covered under the Act, anyway.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They have been covered since 1947.

MR. WELSH: In this one only.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in all these things we have

to draw the line some place. It is the same as in the debate we had about taxes on meals. We have to draw the line some place, and we reach a point where we have to say "this is it" and I think that is the position the Civil Service Commission took, and which was taken by the people who are interested in this fund. It seems to me this is reasonable. No doubt it may be-- and perhaps might be-- cases below this line, we would all like to help. That always happens. But, at the same time, when dealing with a particular question like this, with 10,000 or 11,000 employees, we have to have the line drawn somewhere. I think that is what we have to do. I admit to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that there will be cases we would all like to help.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is not a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of equity. The line is here being drawn, in effect, between male and female employees--

MR. FROST: Oh no.

MR. WELSH: No, it is covered in the interpretation section.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is exactly what you are doing. Why not?

Amendment Agreed to Part 2, paragraph section one (as amended) agreed to.

Bill No. 97 reported.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE LORD'S DAY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 116, "An Act to provide for certain exceptions

to the Lord's Day Act (Canada)", Mr. Porter.

On Section 1.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): On section one, Mr. Chairman, while we are waiting, I wonder if this is properly worded to look after daylight saving time.

MR. PORTER: There is an amendment I propose to move. It will be an amendment to a later section, and not to section one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I just at this moment received this amended copy of the bill, handed to me after it was called. Is there any other bill which can be taken up in Committee, in the meantime.

MR. PORTER: I do not know why these were not distributed before. There are very minor amendments, one in the next section we will come to, is very slight, and the other provides for daylight saving time. That is all they amount to.

Section One agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to Section 2, by the addition to sub-section 6 thereof, the following words .

"May provide for the regulation and control of any matter or in connection with such public games and sports"

In other words, that adds to the power of the municipality by by-law, giving them the power to regulate, control public games and sports. They also have power to

regulate and control any other matters which may have to be done in connection therewith.

MR. G. B. ELLIS(Essex North): Mr. Chairman, when the bill came up, I asked the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost), through the Chairman, what his interpretation of the word "sport" was, and whether or not that would allow the opening of theatres during these hours. The hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) shook his head, and since then I have consulted Webster for a definition of the word "sport", and I find it says this:

> "That which diverts, makes mirth, pastime, amusement, some particular play, game or mode of amusement".

In view of the fact that this bill deals with sports, I would ask the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) whether or not under this bill it would be possible for the threatres to be open, during the hours set forth in the bill.

MR. FROST: No. it is not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How do we know what the courts, or anybody else is going to say, whether they are going to give that interpretation to the word "sport" or not. Would it not be preferrable if "sports" were defined in this bill.

MR. PORTER: "Sports" is the word used in the Lord's Day Act, and it is not defined in the Lord's Day Act, Whatever it may mean in the Lord's Day Act, it means in this Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not defined in that Act?

MR. PORTER: No. So if it does not mean anything, then the Lord's Day Act is ineffective, as the hon. members know.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was not suggesting that it did not mean anything, but it is quite possible some people may think it means what the dictionary says it means, rather than what some of the hon. ministers think.

MR. PORTER: Well, let them think.

MR. FROST: There will be no license issued to theatres to operate on Sundays, anyway. That is "out".

TAKE "C" FOLLOWS

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Supposing a municipality passed a Bill to carry on a Sunday sport which would include, in my opinion, theatres. What would happen then?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Is the hon. member (Mr. Brown) suggesting that the word "theatre" is a sport? Does he consider that the word "sport" includes going to the theatre?

MR. BROWN: Yes. And I am very serious.

MR. PORTER: You have a distorted view.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Could it not be conceived that the showing of a film on this new-fangled thing called television,--if a film was showing on television of a baseball game or of a fight, on Sunday, could that not be classified as "sport" since you would be observing it in the same manner as if you went to Maple Leaf Gardens?

MR. PORTER: Would the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) be in favour of that?

MR. SALSBERG: I am asking for an answer.

MR. PORTER: You did not ask a question.

MR. SALSBERG: I am asking if the public wished to see a moving picture of a fight or on the television at some place at which money would be collected or charged on a Sunday, would that be considered "sport," in the same manner as watching the same sport in an arena. I suggest that to him on the basis of the interpretation of the word "sport". While it might not be possible to see a picture of the ordinary sport, pictures could be shown and money charged.

MR. FROST: I cannot conceive how it could be included in any definition of the word "sport".

MR. SALSBERG: What is the difference between watching something on television and charging admission, and watching

that same game in the Arena ? There is no difference. You could visualize someone erecting a big apparatus and showing a picture of the Giants defeating the Yankees.

MR. FROST: There are always ingenious people who try to get around things, and I can say as treasurer of the province we usually catch up with them. Some ingenious people, will try to get around the Act, and we will catch them. We will get around to that. We mean what the Act says, and if anyone tries to get around the Act we will get around to them. There will not be any theatres open on Sunday in this province and there will not be a lot of things which my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) seems to think. We will catch them in our net before we are through.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: "Fearless Fosdick".

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): I have given a lot of thought to this section. I would have spoken on this in second reading, but it was a long debate and I thought the House was tired and I could present my views on this section now.

I want to say this, on that section of the Bill dealing with the franchise; it cannot have the approval of young persons like ourselves. It is illogical and indiscriminate and unfair and completely unjustified. This government has not yet put forward arguments or reasons for this indiscriminate legislation, and it has not put forward any arguments which make sense to me. This Bill deals with a moral subject that is of vital importance to all the people of the province, and is vitally important to the young people of this province

..... who are living in one room.

What right have you to designate the people who are to

vote on decisions of this kind, and that is what you are doing. Why can property-holders and municipal electors decide for the people who live in one room, with regard to Sunday Sports?

In order to understand the side of the group that is being excluded, I compiled some figures the other day showing the number of people eligible to vote in Toronto on provincial and municipal elections in 1948. I found that voting on the provincial list there was 465,876 people and the number of people on the municipal list was 367,387.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): 387,598.

MR. SCOTT: I got these figures from the department the other day, and they were 367,387.

MR. PORTER: These are the 1948 figures. Municipal electors, 387,598. It is apparent that the municipal electors represent 83.2 per cent.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): That is multiple calculation.

MR. SCOTT:(Peterborough): I telephoned the city clerk and request from him the total number of eligible electors in 1948 and he said 367,387.

MR. PORTER: There is not much difference, we both got it from the same source, but different figures.

MR. SALSBERG: Yours is a typographical error.

MR. SCOTT: If you compare them you will find a difference of 98,498, and if you have a duplication in municipal voting, I feel there were about 100,000 people kept from voting on a question of this kind in Toronto. 100,000 people in Toronto will have no say on a vote which deals with the question of Sunday sports.

MR. PORTER: Toronto has already voted.

MR. FROST: Do you want another vote?

MR. SCOTT: Do you want to repeal it? We do not know

how the vote would be in Toronto if a vote is held.

MR. PORTER: If you are talking about Toronto, we might not have a Bill at all.

MR. FROST: Do you want another vote in Toronto?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is not the point.

MR. PORTER: If what the hon. member (Mr. Scott) says is accepted, it would mean another vote in Toronto. If it is decided we should not adopt this, and adopt what the hon. member (Mr. Scott) proposes, there would have to be a vote.

MR. TEMPLE (High Park): Let us have another vote.

MR. PORTER: Decide what you want.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): You are putting me off, let me finish.

MR. PORTER: This is in Committee and you are asking questions.

MR. SCOTT: There is a difference of 98,000, and taking into consideration the large number of duplications in the wards around 100,000 that had no say in the last vote and would have no say in any future vote, unless you repealed or changed the law. I want to know why it is that you feel these people have no right to make their decisions and voice their opinions on a question of this kind. It is not a property question, but a question that deals with an important part of ourselves, and with people who live in single rooms and they have the right to voice their opinions, and your government has no right to take it away from them.

Let us discuss the reasons given by the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost). In his speech he advanced certain reasons why he felt the vote should be restricted to the municipal electors. On March 23, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said

"the electors who elect the council are the same electors who vote on this question in any municipality . I think that is perfectly reasonable and desirable."

I can agree to the point that people who vote on Bills of this kind should be electing the council. I submit that everyone over 21 should have a vote.

MR. PRTER: That has nothing to do with this Bill. It simply says the electors shall have the vote. If the hon. member (Mr. Scott) is arguing as to who should be the electors, then the hon. member (Mr. Scott) should deal with that in a Bill on that question.

MR. FROST: There is a Bill by an Opposition hon. member dealing with this.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I am saying the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made the statement that the electors who elect the council are the same electors who voted. My objection is to the theory that everyone over 21 has a chance to elector the councillors. In the Bill, as it stands now, you are prohibiting 100,000 people from expressing their views. There is no other conclusion and it is inescapable. It is not restricted to Toronto; it will apply to all the other cities in the province. I am talking about Toronto because I have some figures, but every city will be affected on a vote of this kind.

I want to suggest that there is no justification in the world for restricting the vote to municipal electors alone. This is a moral question that affects a very important part of our lives, and everyone has a right to their say. I am a member of this present Legislature, and I had no say on the plebiscite or on any future vote, and I am quite properly fighting anything which will cut out my right. It is ridiculous and cannot be justified.

The second reason advanced by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in his speech was that if you allowed everyone over 21 to have a vote it would entail an expensive enumeration system in the event another vote would happen. We all know that it would cost money to enumerate all the voters over 21, but when you put that up against the impact of a question of this kind, it would be my suggestion that we are justified to spend more money to ensure these people a vote on a question of this kind.

MR. FROST: Are you arguing that we should have anoth r vote in Toronto?

MR. PORTER: Is that your proposal?

MR. MacLEOD: Would you be in favour of doing that?

MR. FROST: No.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches):I Will not be side-tracked.

MR. PORTER: That is a practical point and the hon. member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) refuses to answer the issue. Answer "yes" or "no".

MR. FROST: The honl member (Mr. Scott, Beaches) is "off the beam".

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Talk to the young people living in one room and you will find out if it is irrelevant.

MR. FROST: It is not relevant to this Bill. If that Bill is passed extending a municipal franchise, that franchise applies. At the present time it is the municipal electors, but we are not getting down to the consideration of this Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) would be through by now if he did not have all these interruptions.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I am voicing my objection as it

now stands. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has put forward two reasons, and the third was that if it were a provincial list there would have to be another vote of some kind if they want to carry a Bill or rescind a Bill. I aannot understand why this distinction was made, and I dould not find anything in the speech of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to justify changes in the procedure purely because you increased it from municipal electors to those over 21. I will wait, and maybe the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) will say something on that.

As I have submitted to the House, none of the reasons submitted make any sense to me at all, and I cannot see how it is justified. If we are democratic, then we are democratic. You are either democratic or undemocratic, there is no halfway democracy, and when you put before the people of this province a question dealing with issues affecting the younger people in this province, you have no right to take the vote away. If it is a democracy, it is a democracy, and we should have a vote. I cannot allow this section to pass without expressing my opposition to it, and I repeat, the restriction is unjustified and undemocratic and illogical and unfounded.

In order to test the opinion of this House, I move that section 3 of the Bill be amended by striking out the word "electors" wherever it appears in the section, and substituting therefor the words" persons qualified to be entered on the voters' list and to vote at elections to the Assembly in the municipality."

MR. FROST: The amendment means that the vote taken in Toronto and Windsor would not count. I oppose this amendment and say it is nonsensical.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The amendment does not relate to Toronto

and Windsor.

MR. FROST: If it does not mean that, does it means that it is perfectly moral for the municipal electors to vote on Sunday sports but immoral if they vote it out?

MR. JOLLIFFE: It now appears in the Liquor License Act defining those who are eligible to vote. Why is it proper in the Liquor License Act and not in this Act?

MR. FROST: Let us have a vote.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): I do not agree with the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) on this subect. I suppose that with the erection of the new Niagara tunnel we will have some 300 to 700 people coming in who have the right to the provincial franchise, and perhaps their votes would be the deciding factor on whether or not Niagara would consent, and as mayor of that city I will not have outside people coming in and saying what we are going to do or not going to do at Niagara Falls.

SOME hhon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUCK: I believe if we are going to extend the universal franchise to everyone it is not the place to do it in this Bill.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon.members have a right to speak more than once in Committee stage?

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. ministers are going to talk twelve times on a Bill, we cannot hold the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) from speaking a second time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to read the amendment first.

The amendment is that Mr. Scott (Beaches) moves:

> "That section three of the Bill be amended by striking out the word 'electors' wherever it appears in the section, and substituting therefor the words: 'persons qualified to be entered on

the voters' list and to vote at elections to the Assembly in these munciipalities' ".

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): To meet the objections by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) a section could be inserted that those voting had to have been there for a certain period.

MR. SALSBERG: I have voted for this Bill and will vote for it until it passes through this House, and I suggest that one could argue against the amendment, but I do not think it is fair to argue that this amendment will automatically call for a new vote in Toronto or Windsor. There is a special section, subsection 4 of section 3, which takes care of Toronto and Windsor, and this amendment will not affect that.

MR. PORTER: You will allow discrimination?

MR. SALSBERG: Do not be facetious.

MR. PORTER: It would be discrimination.

MR. SALSBERG: It would amount to this; that the purpose of the amendment will apply henceforth in Toronto and Windsor, if a demand would be made for a reconsideration of the question, and no hon. member can be opposed to the proposed condition of the amendment. Let us not try to confuse it. The amendment is not for a new vote in Toronto and Windsor.

I speak as one who voted for the Bill on second reading.

Amendment negatived.

MR. WM. DENNISON: (St. David): I would like to speak on section three from a different angle.

I agree with everything the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) said.....

MR. PORTER: The section was carried.

MR. DENNISON: No. All we did was defeat an amendment to the section. I would like to deal with the ballot, and I am sure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will support me on this.

(Take D follows)

because this ballot we have before us, is a little different to the type of ballot eitherToronto or Windsor voted upon, and with all respect, I think the ballot submitted to the electors in Toronto was a loaded ballot, and I think that was because it included commercial as well as amateur sports in the same ballot, and I think this ballot is also a loaded ballot. I think this should be specific. I think the municipality should have the right, if it desires to legalize any sport, to say, for instance, "skiing", and they should have a plebescite on whether or not you are in favour of skiing, or hockey, or whatever sport it decides to have, in the municipality.

Therefore, the people could vote for themselves, but they should not be asked to vote on the question, "Are you in favour of public games and sports on the Lord's Day to be regulated by a Municipal By-law, under the authority of the Lord's Day Act".

I do not think we should always be ballotting. This, as the hon. premier (Mr. Frost) has said, will settle the thing for a paragraph.

MR. FROST: I did not say any such a thing.

MR. DENNISON: I think if the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) will look up the record of his speech, he will find that he did say that.

MR. FROST: I never said such a thing. I said that this plan would settle it for a generation. In Toronto, for instance, these provisions might be repealed next year. It settles the principal issue in the province, for a generation.

MR. DENNISON: Then it is not really the desire to have ballot so wide that the municipalities, by the terms of reference, should be able to go on all the time, without submitting it back to the people.

I agree with the hon. premier (Mr. Frost) on that. I think that is desirable. I think that municipalities should be able to be more specific in these ballots. I will give you a reason.

A great many people in the city of Toronto, who voted against Sunday sports, were not really against amateur sports at all. They wanted all kinds of amateur sports, where the participants took part in the sport, and enjoyed themselves in the park on Sundays. I believe a great majority wanted that. But because this ballot was loaded in the city of Toronto, the vote was smaller than it would otherwise have been.

I often think of a speech by Gen. John MacNaughton, made one time shortly after he began to organize the Canadian Army. He said he was amazed to find out in the Army that the average young man did not know how to play baseball. He was a fan, but he was not a player. He knew all about the professional baseball teams, he could tell you about the Maple Leafs, and other teams, but he could not play baseball himself.

I hope we will get around in the city of Toronto to have some sports in which the people can participate, rather than just be spectators. If the municipality should stay with that type of sport, I think they will be able to have

a ballot along that line, without having it as wide as it is.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following motion-- and I hope the hon. attorney general (Mr. Porter) will support me-- as follows:

"That Sec.3. (1) be amended by striking out the second paragraph and substituting the following:

"Are you in favour of the following by-law regulating public games and sports on the Lord's Day, under the authority of the Lord's Day (Ontario) Act, 1950?"

And the rest of commercial sports proposed to be permitted shall be included as part of the Act.

I would like to move the amendment. I think it will solve this problem in regard to much of the criticism which has been levelled against the government, that you are making this a little too wide.

They can select the sport, and make it a discriminatory ballot. I will be glad to send a copy over to the hon. premier (Mr. Frost).

MR. PORTER: We do not need a copy.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the hon. member for St. Davids (Mr. Dennison) made an unanswerable speech?

MR. FROST: We are just dumbfounded.

MR. PORTER: We are bowled over, as in a bowling alley.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Before you put that, without, I think only one word might be changed in the ballot. I think we have been unrealistic about this. "Public Sports" might

not be commercial sports. Let us be realistic, and change that one word "public" to "commercial".

MR. PORTER: Oh no. In the Lord's Day Act, the words are "public games and sports". We are making exceptions to the Lord's Day Act, and as to certain things provided in that Act in those very words, and we will stick to those words.

MR. CALDER: Can you think of no improvement?

MR. PORTER: Public games or sports might be amateur game or sport, which is carried on in a stadium, where an admission is charged. That would make it a public game, and if you limit it, you may cut out the amateur sport which might be wished for by many people in this province, and which the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) might wish to support himself.

MR. JOLLIFFE; I think I agree with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) except with this reservation; he said we are making an exception to the Lord's Day Act. I would say "we are attempting to make an exception".

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): I must beg the pardon of the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) on this question, and I would like to ask if he can give us some explanation of the press reports yesterday that some confidential information had been given out to the Board of Control in Toronto regarding this Lord's Day Act, and that you have requested that nothing be done.

MR. FROST: Oh no; nothing to it.

MR.H.C. NIXON (Brant): That is what "Jack Innes" said.

Section (4) agreed to.

On Section (5).

MR. T. H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment:

"That the Bill be amended by the addition of the following section: "5A". Where a question is submitted in a municipality under section 3 or 4, neither that question nor any other question shall be submitted in the municipality until after the expiration of a period of three years from the date of such submission."

MR. FROST: Oh no. We are "agin" it.

MR. ISLEY: The reason for that is that 10% of the electors could petition the municipality, and that might mean you could have a group on each side petitioning the council of a municipality, which is having an election, and you would have a political football in the municipality, year after year.

MR. MILLARD: Is that not the provision provided for in the referendum or local option question, with regard to other matters, such as liquor?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, we feel that is completely undesirable. After all, if people can vote this in with, they can vote this out with equal facility. They are not saddled with anything. If they find, after voting it in, that it is unsatisfactory, they can throw it out the window--and fast.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it the government is not accepting this amendment.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE; I will make a prediction, which is something I very rarely do, and that is that you will be introducing this amendment yourselves, within the next three or four years.

The Amendment negatived.

Section (5) agreed to.

On Section (6).

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to Section (6)--

MR. MILLARD: Starting to tidy up already?

MR. PORTER: The hon.member (Mr. Millard) was not here when I mentioned that before.

MR. MILLARD: We knew you were going to. We saw it in the paper yesterday.

MR. FROST: Do you believe everything you see in the papers?

MR. PORTER: Who said what, in the papers?

MR. SALSBERG: What paper?

MR. PORTER: I move an amendment to Section (6), to read as follows:

"Therefore so long as the time commonly occured in a municipality is one hour in advance of standard time, the times mentioned in Section (1), or any such by-law, shall be reckoned in accordance with the times so commonly occurred, and not standard time".

Then, sub-section (6) will be renumbered to be known as Section (7), and Section (7) of the Act will be renumbered

as Section (8).

MR. MacLEOD: That was in the Globe and Mail last night.

MR. MILLARD: What is that for?

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows perfectly well what it is for. It is to cover the situation of daylight time. Perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Millard) does not know that there is daylight saving time in effect during certain times in the summer.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) is mistaken. What it is for is to remedy an oversight, when he introduced the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Nothing of the kind.

MR. FROST: There are no supermen in the world, except those who sit opposite in this chamber.

Section (6) as amended agreed to.

Section (7) (formerly Section (6) agreed to.

Section (8) (formerly Section (7) agreed to.

Bill No. 116 (as amended) reported.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S ACT, 1949.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The eleventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 121, an"Act to amend the Fire Department's Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to this Section (1), which I wish to introduce. This is to provide for a case of collective bargaining between fire fighters and the municipal council.

Under the present section, the question of sections was omitted. The present section provides for remuneration and working conditions, and it is intended by this amendment to include the word "pensions" and also the same thing will apply in another amendment to be introduced with respect to another Bill. This says:

(1) "When requested in writing by a majority of the full-time fire fighters, the council of the municipality shall bargain in good faith with a bargaining committee of the full-time fire fighters for the purpose of defining, determining and providing for remuneration, pensions or working conditions of the full-time fire fighters other than the chief of the fire department."

That is one change. Sub-section (2) has added to it as follows:

(4) "When the request involves pensions under a pension plan established or to be established under The Municipal Act, notice of such request shall be given to the Department of Municipal Affairs which may determine the maximum pension benefits which may be included in any agreement, decision or award with respect to such pension plan."

That provides for notice to be given to the Department, so it will be able to go into the matter, under the powers it already has. This has been asked for by the Fire Fighters.

Section (1) agreed to.

On Section (2).

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrews): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) could explain why, in the first place, he removed the original section of the Bill, and whether that is not a capitulation to the pressure from certain municipalities.

MR. PORTER: No, there are later sections inthe Act which sufficiently cover it as it is.

MR. SALSBERG: It is quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the 1949 Bill was very satisfactory from the point of view of the Fire Fighters, and from the point of view of those municipal governments who are in favour of collective bargaining. But resistance developed from other municipal sources who are opposed to the principle of collective bargaining, and who do not approve of the provisions of the Act of last year, which enabled the provincial authorities to withhold contrib tions if the municipal government failed to live up to the provisions of this Act.

Now, it seems to me that the amendments are mainly the result of such pressure, and in that regard, it is a retrogressive step, and I can see no reason why the government should have taken it.

It is obviously they are trying to mend some of their fences, which were broken wide open as a result of the present Bill, by the amendments they are now bringing in. The amendments will repair some of the damage which the original Bill would have caused but still leaves gaps open in what was, until now, a fairly good Bill from every point of view. You are no longer authorizing the withholding of contributions. I do

not see why the government should have made this section a most reactionary section of the municipal government.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Are there copies of the amendment available?

MR. PORTER: They have been distributed to the leaders.

MR. FROST: We are not making speed very fast. If we are to complete these estimates by tomorrow afternoon, we will have to go on.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a principle at the stake here.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I say--

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. MILLARD: This is on Section (4) of Section (1). It is the amendment about which the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) just finished speaking. Am I correct in repeating again that what you suggested is that when the request involves pensions, under a pension plan established or to be established, under a Municipal Act, notice of such request shall be given to the Department of Municipal Affairs which may determine the maximum pension benefits which may be included in any agreement, or decision, or award in respect of such pension plan. Is that the amendment.

MR. PORTER: That is one of them.

MR. MILLARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that the previous section is without meaning, because what you have is the final arbitration board. There will be no collective bargaining of these questions, to meet the request of the

Fire Fighters, who might put in such a thing. If you are going to have the Department of Municipal Affairs finally decide these matters, and say what the maximum benefit will be, it seems to me there is just no rhyme or reason to this suggestion in the first part of the amendment, introduced by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) at this late day.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) may not appreciate that the Department of Municipal Affairs has power-- and has had for many years-- to fix the maximum amount of pensions payable by municipalities, in consideration of the capacity of the municipality to discharge its obligations, under a pension scheme. All this does is provide that where a pension is to be considered, under some collective bargaining negotiations, the hon. minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) shall have notice of what is being done, in advance, so that he will be able to figure out what the municipality can afford to do.

The Municipal Affairs Department is charged with the responsibility of trying to maintain the solvency of a municipality. I do not see what criticism there can possibly be. If some collective bargaining arrangement is entered into,, which is going to put the municipality into bankruptcy, surely that would not be a very good result.

MR. MILLARD: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) seriously suggest that a pension plan entered into by a municipality under collective bargaining, with the consent of the civic employees, namely, the firemen, is going to be the means of putting a municipality either in or out of solvency,

that they are going to bankrupt the municipality? The thing is absurd.

MR. PORTER: It is not absurd. It has been there for years, and has been very useful.

MR. MILLARD: Many of the absurdities have been in existence for years.

MR. PORTER: It is not an absurdity. It has been of great benefit to the people. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) knows that, too.

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I just came in to hear the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) say that the National Association of Fire Fighters had agreed to this change?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. WISMER: When did they agree?

MR. PORTER: They were in my office the other day.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Have they seen the Bill.

MR. PORTER: I do not know whether they have seen the draft or not.

MR. PARK: Oh now, we are getting somewhere.

MR. PORTER: I do not consult any outside people when any Bill is drafted. The government is responsible for the legislation. If the people do not like it, we will know about it soon enough from them.

MR. WISMER: They certainly did not like the original, because we had many telegrams about it. What chance did they have to see it? This is the first we have seen it; what chance did they have?

MR. PORTER: We have to decide how far we can go, and are prepared to go. We are a responsible government. We consult the Fire Fighters, when it affects their interest. We did that.

Section (2) agreed to.

On Section (3).

TAKE "E" FOLLOWS.

On section 3.

MR. SALSBERG: Section 3 drops subsections 2 to 4 of section 8 of the original Fire Department Act of 1949. It is precisely in this section where the government retreats from a good position to a bad one and in principle, surrenders the recognition of the union of firefighters as a necessity under that Bill, and merely covers it with the amendment they moved earlier, without corresponding protection in the amendment.

I will read subsection 3 of the original Act:

> "Where not less than 50 per cent belong to a trade union, any request made under subsection 2 shall be made by the union."

That has been dropped now, as some of the other protective clauses as well, and I think it should be stated -- and I state as a member of the House, -not as an authorized spokesman of the association -- that this is retrogression, and in favour of the anti-union effort of municipal government. The firefighters may accept some of the amendments as an improvement on the original Bill, but I am certain they would have been happier if that section had not been dropped. I have spoken to firefighters, and they have spoken to me, and their almost universal statement was that "Mr. Blackwell gave us protection and we are not figuring on losing it." They have good grounds.

Just read that one subsection and you will realize what they are losing.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The firefighters have been satisfied with this. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) want to withdraw this Bill? The firefighters are satisfied; their suggestions have been met.

MR. SALSBERG: No one asked that subsections 2 to 4 of

section 8 of the Bill be dropped, to my knowledge.

Section 4, formerly section 2, agreed to; section 5, formerly section 3, agreed to; section 6, formerly section 4, agreed to; section 7, formerly section 5, agreed to; section 8, formerly section 6, agreed to.

Bill No. 121 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE POLICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): There are some amendments to this Bill which are exactly the same as the amendments in the Fire Department Act, and covers a similar situation.

MR. CH. MILLARD (York West): Why all these amendments? What has been the consideration that has been given since this Bill was introduced to have so many amendments. We have not had the chance to discuss the impact of the legislation introduced first. It is not fair to ask hon. members to consider these questions and assume responsibility for passage of these Acts, and I would like further information as to why they were so hastily produced. It was brought to the attention of the House the other day that we have a number of amendments.

MR. PORTER: If there are objections, we might consider waiving the amendment.

Section 1, agreed to.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Are we moving the same amendment as to the other Act?

MR. PORTER: I think that is right.

MR. PARK: On section 1, the position of the firemen and of the policemen with regard to collective bargaining is different. You allow firefighters to join unions and not policemen. How can they be the same? How do you distinguish between the police association and the firefighters' union, which is an affiliate of a trade union.

MR. PORTER: There is the wording in the section which provides for bargaining with the members of the board, that is the bargaining committee of the police force. It is merely intended to provide for pensions being part of the subject matter in these negotiations, as with the firefighters.

MR. MILLARD: Who will determine whether the parties doing the bargaining are in good faith? That has been a fault all through the years. Who has the interpretation of that?

MR. PORTER: That is in the main Act, and not up for discussion. I will not go into the broad question on that kind on amendment. There has been good faith so far with regard to bargaining on the part of both the firefighters and the policemen.

MR. MILLARD: That does not answer my question. In the main Act and the previous Act and before these amendments were introduced, my understanding was that the government in the final analysis was satisfied that the obligations under the Act had not been fulfilled. Will there be any way of making sure that bargaining in good faith is taking place between the police association on the one hand, and the municipal authorities, or the firefighters union or association, on the other hand? Who is to determine this, and say so in so many words?

MR. FROST: The association is completely satisfied with these arrangements.

MR. MILLARD: Are you sure?

Section 2 agreed to; section 3, formerly section 2, agreed to; section 4, formerly section 3, agreed to; section 5, formerly section 4, agreed to; section 6, formerly section 5, agreed to; section 7, formerly section 8, agreed to; section 8, formerly section 6, agreed to; section 9, formerly section 8, agreed to; section 10, formerly section 9, agreed to; section 11, formerly section 10, agreed to.

Bill No. 122 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

THE INVESTMENT CONTRACTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend the Investment Contracts Act, 1948," Mr. Porter.

Section 1 to 7 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 123, reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 14.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend the Continuation Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 124 reported;

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 15.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend the Registry Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 125 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 16

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 128, "The Division Courts Act, 1950", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): This is a very lengthy Bill and if there are no objections or questions, it would be more simple, perhaps, if we did not enumerate all the sections. I have explained it on two different occasions, and maybe in two different ways.

MR. FROST: This is a reconsideration of the Division Courts Act which applied for over one hundred years, and these sections have been prepared as a result of research by the law officers, and a committee of judges and others, and there would not seem any necessity to go through the Bill section by section.

My hon. friend from London (Mr. Calder) knows the circumstances, but there may be some point on which he would like enlightenment.

MR. PORTER: I do not think so, he has nothing of such small magnitude.

Bill No.128 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 17.

PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventeenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Draingge Act", Mr. Doucett.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 130 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 18.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighteenth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 131 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 52.

THE TOWN OF PARRY SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-second Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound", Mr. Johnston.

Sections 1 to 3 agreed to; Schedule A agreed to; Schedule B agreed to; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 53.

CONGREGATION OF THE PRIESTS OF THE SACRED HEART

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 8, "An Act to incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart", Mr. Calder.

Section 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 8 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 54.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND TRUST COMPANIES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifty-fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Companies", Mr. Chartrand.

Section 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to; the preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 30 reported.

(Take F follows)

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole House reports certain Bills with amendments and certain Bills without amendments and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 7, the Department of Agriculture.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(page F-2 follows)

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture is no longer a one-man show but one team whether you live on the banks of the Ottawa River or on the Manitoba boundary or in the Windsor and southern Great Lakes area. It would be impossible for me to carry on the work without the loyal and efficient staff to whom I can delegate my authority. A man can only go as high as he delegates authority and the more he does so, the higher he goes. I have tried to impress this on all my staff. I have told my Agricultural Representatives that each one is the Minister of his county and that his success or failure will be judged on whether he has been able to make the farmers in his district any richer and any happier. The hours of work are long and indefinite from early in the morning until meetings are through late in the evening. Only a great love of the work could carry them through the trials and difficulties that they have.

There are some names that I feel I should mention. The first is my Deputy, Cliff Graham. A god medallist at Guelph he entered the Department and left it. When I started the Junior Farmer movement and was looking for the right man to put in charge I went to see Cliff Graham. He was getting fifty per cent more than I could offer him and he felt that he could not accept such a reduction in salary. I told him that in twenty years he could revolutionize the whole farming profession through these Junior Farmers. He caught the vision and he came. Farming today is not just the planting of seeds and the reaping of crops. The modern farmer is a manufacturer of raw materials. In fact he must be a grower, a manufacturer and then a salesman. This can only be accomplished by training the young men. If you were to take the three top men in their

profession throughout the Dominion of Canada you would have to include Cliff Graham, Bill Watson, my Commissioner of Live Stock, Jim Garner, Director of Extension and Frank Perkin in marketing. Similarly if you think of the top veterinarian in Canada the name of Dr. MacNabb immediately comes to your mind and the brilliant young men associated with him. The same is true of our young professors at the Ontario Agricultural College. Many have been offered positions elsewhere at salaries much higher than we can afford to pay but from a sense of loyalty to the College and to their country they have refused.

When I was Minister in 1931, Maryland University offered one of our men a position with a salary fifty per cent higher than he was getting but he refused. I went to see him and asked him why he had not accepted the offer and he replied that money was not everything. He was happy in his work and he had made many friends there. Besides it was worth a lot of money to him to bring up his son under the Union Jack. As Minister of Agriculture I have made many great personal friendships which I will take with me when I go and the memory of which I value more than money.

I would like to say just a few words about the progress we are making with Rural Hydro. When I was Reeve of Toronto Township ours was the first place in the province of Ontario to get hydro. We started in 1912 with 64 consumers and now we have 5,300 in the township of Toronto alone. By the end of last year $89,955,017 had been spent on rural hydro of which the provincial government paid one-half the cost. I would like to include in Hansard the following tables in this connection:

RURAL POWER DISTRICTS

RURAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Year	Increase during Year	Accumulated to end of each year
1929	$	$ 9,324,515
1930	3,340,734	12,665,249
1931	2,842,334	15,507,583
1932	1,456,645	16,964,228
1933	729,648	17,693,876
1934	613,636	18,307,512
1935	874,754	19,182,266
1936	1,492,409	20,674,675
1937	3,464,055	24,138,730
1938	4,422,484	28,561,214
1939	4,914,934	33,476,148
1940	3,138,936	36,615,084
1941	2,197,509	38,812,593
1942	483,402	39,295,995
1943	198,643	39,494,638
1944	1,762,561	41,257,199
1945	3,279,281	44,536,480
1946	4,760,490	49,296,970
1947	5,829,299	55,126,269
1948	12,247,288	67,373,557
1949	22,581,460	89,955,017

(page F-5 follows)

RURAL POWER DISTRICTS

CONSUMERS SERVED

Year	Served During Year			Accumulated to end of each year		
	Farm	Non Farm	Total	Farm	Non Farm	Total
1939				53,240	58,281	111,521
1940	5,488	5,349	10,837	58,728	63,630	122,358
1941	4,576	4,320	8,896	63,304	67,950	131,254
1942	444	2,461	2,905	63,748	70,411	134,159
1943	542	1,463	2,005	64,290	71,874	136,164
1944	Reclassified		8,054	" 59,600	84,618	144,218
1945	5,500	6,842	12,342	65,100	91,460	156,560
1946	7,200	9,602	16,802	72,300	101,062	173,362
1947	6,400	14,291	20,691	78,700	115,353	194,053
1948	10,054	15,982	26,036	88,754	131,335	220,089
1949	14,032	21,174	35,206	102,786	152,509	255,295

" Classification changed in 1944 to exclude former farm classes now classified as Commercial etc.

PERCENTUM OF FARMS SERVED - OCTOBER 31 - 1949

Served by H.E.P.C. from Rural	102,786
Served by Municipalities and private companies approx.	1,500
	104,286
Total farms in Ontario 5 acres and on	173,845

From these tables it will be seen that out of 173,845 farms in Ontario of 5 acres and more 104,286 have been served with hydro. But I am even more surprised to find that 152,509 non-farmers have also received hydro showing that there are more non-farmers than farmers in rural Ontario. If we can build 3,000

miles in 1950 and the same in 1951, we can see the end in sight of rural hydro in Ontario.

Ontario is changing from an agricultural to a manufacturing province. A glance at the following figures will illustrate the rapidity of this development. In 1871 out of a population of 1,620,851, 70% were farmers: today with a population of approximately 4,411,000 only 15% are farmers. Further evidence of the change in emphasis from agriculture to manufacturing is the fact that of 1,180 new factories established in Canada between the end of the war and November, 1948, 570 came to the province of Ontario, many of which were very sizeable concerns. Only a balanced economy based on a combination of agriculture and industry can ensure for our people stability and a high standard of living. Probably in no other part of the world is this more in evidence than in Ontario today. This means that the pattern of our agricultural economy is undergoing a change. Our best market is now our domestic market while the tourist trade is our best foreign market. The greatest prosperity and the highest standard of living will be ours when the farmers can feed all our population without importing or exporting very much. That is the objective for which we are striving in Ontario.

Last year while cash income from farm sales was up in Canada 40 million dollars, in Ontario it was down 27 million dollars due almost entirely to weather conditions. The total value of farm products in Ontario was just under one billion dollars. As Minister of Agriculture the height of my ambition has been to get a cash income of one billion dollars. I never dreamed of one billion dollars. Farmers do not believe in dividing the wealth: they believe in creating new wealth.

From the very beginning up to the present marketing has

always been our chief weakness. Year by year, we are overcoming this problem a little but we have a long way to go and I feel that now we are commencing to see the development of a better marketing system.

Twenty years ago we started to encourage the building of cold storages. These were intended to take care of gluts and prolong the marketing season of any crop. Year,by year, more of them are being built.

Another solution to our marketing problem is the promotion of high yield clubs which have been formed throughout the province to show the farmers living in that locality what high yield crops can be grown. I remember a few years ago when we started the 500 Bushel Potato Clubs. Eighty-eight farmers exceeded 500 bushels and two exceeded 800 bushels per acre. We started at 30 bushels per acre in soybeans. This year six growers got over 50 bushels per acre. Again in our Wheat Clubs we established 50 bushels as the maximum we could hope to achieve. Last year eleven farmers obtained over 60 bushels per acre. We are using the same method with oats, shell corn and barley. This is purely a marketing operation.

Then we grow new varieties of farm products. Many of those established have increased yields and lowered the cost of production. The same holds good for long-term pasture. On 481 farms in every county and district in Ontario long-term pastures have been laid down to increase the yield ofmilk and beef. Many farmers have proved that they can obtain,5,000 to,6,000 pounds of milk per acre and 200 to 300 pounds of beef. If we could only do this on every farm in the province our costs would go down and our profits would be much greater. We are also trying to lengthen the season of pasture as it is from 50 to 75% cheaper to feed cattle from pasture than in the barn. If we can get

grasses than come early in the spring and late in the fall and do well in dry weather, then we will have greatly cheapened the cost of production. This is one of the most important research projects we are doing now.

I believe that the youth of today are better than they have ever been since the beginning of the world. For many generations people have said that the young people are not as good as they were in the old days, that the schools are not as good or the churches or the colleges and universities. Whenever I read of a man saying that I think that man is settled, his brains have jelled and he is finished no matter how young he may be or how clever he is. He has no conception of the future and without that vision of the future people perish.

Especially in the field of farm operations and farm teaching it is not a question of year by year but at least a twenty year forward movement. When you buy a farm unless you have immense wealth it is at least fifteen years before you get the farm in the condition in which you want it. I have had something to do with three farms in my 50 years of farming. My home farm which I took over 51 years ago had been rented for 37 years to one man. I could not afford to re-establish the farm immediately but tried to do ten acres a year. It was only when I had gone over the ten acres for the second time that I got the farm in the condtion I wished. Looking into the future I have great faith in the prosperity and happiness of those young men who are going into farming today. They have a profession that has a bright future both in comfort and happiness.

Today we are promoting the Junior Farmer movement to an extent never dreamed of in this province or in any other province of Canada. All over the province we have vocational

teaching for young farm men and women covering all phases of farm operations: chemistry of the soil, marketing, conservation, crops of all kinds, grain, fruits and vegetables, teaching the young farmers what each crop takes out of the soild and what must be in the soil before he can grow a perfect crop and also the best culture methods. As a result of such teaching we are growing higher crops per acre than we ever did since we have been keeping records in the Department.

In live stock we teach them what type of animal to keep, how to breed them and how to feed them. Through artificial insemination and the sale of better beef bulls, both of which have been so far an immense success, we are gradually raising the production of milk and beef per acre to the highest level it has ever been in the province. As I said before we have a long way to go yet but at least we have laid a foundation, which I believe to be permanent, and which we havenneeded for the last forty years. Proof of the success of our breeding policy is the tremendous demand for our dairy cattle from all parts of the world. We have been cramped a lot lately by lack of dollars in foreign countries but last year we sent out to 16 foreign countries 45,080 dairy cattle valued at over ten million dollars and 102,575 beef cattle at a value of 25 million dollars. I am looking forward to exceeding this amount in a few years but we have laid now the foundation for an export market. One of our first Junior Farmers in the province this year sold a bull of his own breeding for $20,000. This is the value of Junior Farming training.

I recall the case of a young farmer who sold a little bull in California, so small he could carry it under his arm. He got $10,000 for it. He then took the mother to Columbus, Ohio, and sold her there at auction for $18,500 -- a total

of $28,500 for a cow born and bred in the county of Peel.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) leaves that point, may I ask a question?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. HOUCK: I think you told the House we exported out of the province of Ontario $25,000,000 worth of beef?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. HOUCK: Have you any idea of the increase in dollars and cents in regard to dairy cattle?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, $10,000,000 in dairy cattle.

I will say nothing about the three colleges at Guelph as the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) has spoken so well. of the value of these colleges and said it so much better than I can, except to say that at no time since they were established have they enjoyed so high a standing as they have today. As has been mentioned forty students came from their universities to take their Master's Degree not only from all the Canadian universities but from Greece, Switzerland, Holland, Szechoslovakia and Cornell University in New York. This would have been impossible when I was Minister twenty years ago. And by the way, I will have fibished fifty years of farming tomorrow night. I start my fifty-first year on Saturday morning.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: In those days an Englishman from Essez, England, lived next door, and had three big, strapping sons. I bought a new binder, which had just started to come in at that time, and this man came over to see me and said, "Mister, I hear you have made a fool of yourself, you have bought a binder. Some one has fooled you.by making you think it will tie grain. It won't, Mister; it can't do it. There is nothing but a ~~x~~ pair of hands will tie grain".

I was old enough even then, fifty years ago, to know that a sycle had been used for generations and a cradle for many years, and I was using a reaper. Before the year was out, that man's four sons went on strike, and my binder cut his grain and tied it.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West); You believe in the strike weapon then, do you, Mr. Minister (Mr. Kennedy)?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. KENNEDY: The combine is here; if any one says that is the last word; if any one suggest electric lights are the last word, then they live in the same age as my grand mother and grandfather lived.

I noticed , the other Sunday morning, it as ten below zero; I brought the thermometer into the house, and put it in my den, about eighteen inches from the window. Where do you think that thermometer went to? Up to 110 degrees - from ten below to one hundred and en above, one hundred and twenty degrees and all because a little bit of glass was beteen the sun and my room. Does any one say we will not harness that sometime? If any hon. member in this house, or any one in this province says that, we are in the same stage as the man who saw the water falling over Niagara Falls and said: "We'll never use that.".

Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take "G" follows).

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr.Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) a question? Perhaps I may be able to give some comparably interesting statistics. We have listened to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) in the most glowing terms --and justifiably so -- talk about the production of the farms in Ontario, about the potentialities and the possibilities, the enormous crops which they are able to produce, the livestock which they are able to raise, comparable I would think no place else in the world.

With all this production of commodities, I often wonder why the cost of living should be so high in Toronto, if it is such a fertile field for production. I come here occasionally here myself, and I have always wanted an opportunity to give hon. members some rather interesting statistics. After listening to what the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) said -- and he made a most eloquent address on behalf of the farmers, I am not criticizing farmers at all, in fact I go to the market once in awhile and the prices to not seem to be out of the way for the produce referred to, but ifyou go into a restaurant or into one of the hotels and buy one of the things to which the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) referred, that is an entirely different story.

Perhaps it is rather irrelevant, but I am forced to the conclusion that in this great fertile valley you speak about, the cost of living in Toronto is one of the most expensive on the North American continent. I keep telling my hon. friends about Miami.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (York East): Give me a ticket, and I will go down there.

MR. COX: Just let me show you; if you gentlemen will take a trip down there, you will find it difficult to reconcile what my hon. friend (Mr. Kennedy) says. This is an organization

with 100 restaurants in the states to the south, Texas, Florida and Alabama, and let me tell you what you can buy there. For breakfast, you can have a choice of grapefruit, orange-juice, hotcakes, syrup and bacon for 45 cents.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Better take the train, George.

MR. COX: I will show you another one; for 60 cents you get your choice of grapefruit, one egg, bacon, toast, butter, muffins and coffee; all for 60 cents.

Here is another one: for 30 cents you get English muffins, choice of fruit, cheese, jelly and coffee. That is in Miami.

MR. MacLEOD: But you ought to try Bowles some time.

MR. COX: This is not Bowles. Here is another number one, if you please: fruit, English muffins and coffee, 25 cents. Why you will not get into a restaurant here for 25 cents.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): You will not get out, anyway.

MR. COX: I go into some of the restaurants in Toronto, and they present quite a contrast. These in Miami are beautiful places, overlooking beautiful parks, palm trees, the ocean where you can see the Gulf Stream, balmy winds, luxurious restaurants, at a summer resort. I go into the restaurants in Toronto, just for comparison, and I order the identical carticle that appears on this menu, and it costs, in every restaurant I go, 15 to 20 percent. more than in Miami, and in the hotels 100 percent. more. It is difficult for me to reconcile.

I brought this back with me to show some of my friends at home, and I hope it may be of interest to some hon. members who anticipate taking a trip to Miami. It is very difficult for me to reconcile what the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) says

about the great possibilities of this fertile field of agriculture, and then go into those restaurants.

I just happened to look over at the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and it reminds me that he mentioned a short time ago something about telephones, he raised the question, made some inquiries as to the cost of telephones -- this is entirely apart from Agriculture, of course.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: Do you know, much to my surprize in Miami, one night I lifted the receiver and put in a telephone call to Port Arthur, which is between 2,000 and 3,000 miles from there. Would you believe it, from Miami you can telephone to Toronto for $2.00. It would cost you nearly that much to telephone across Ontario. So, I think there was some justification for the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Molliffe) raising his question. I just happened to think of it now when looking at him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: An inspiration.

MR. COX: Yes, it gave me inspiration.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I hope you do not think of high prices when you look at me?

MR. COX: Possibly a lot of the people in Ontario, with high prices, should do what you suggest.

Hon. members might be interested in these comparisons. Perhaps they will stop me, this has nothing to do with Agriculture.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: I do not like living in Toronto.

MR. SALSBERG: Are you running down this city?

MR. COX: Running it down? I have said my personal

opinion is that this is one of the most expensive places to live on the North American continent.

AN hon. MEMBER: You are telling us.

AN hon. MEMBER: What about quality?

MR. COX: Quality? I do not know it is any different when it comes to quality. Let me show you these comparisons, I hope you do not stop me. There may be a few exceptions, New York, Los Angeles, Washington, but this will be interesting to the ladies. Take the comparison between buying in Minneapolis and in Winnipeg. You pay $119.50 for a Eureka vacuum cleaner; the same thing on the other side costs $19.25. Paris shirts -- everybody buys them -- costs $4.75 here, and $3.50 there. There are no ladies here --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: -- but Jonathan-Logan -- oh, I beg your pardon, the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) will be interested in this, $19.95 here and you get the same article over there for $9.35. That makes it pretty difficult to reconcile. Someone made the suggestion, and I do not know that it would be entirely inappropriate, but hon. members of the House should get an extra living allowance for being forced to live in Toronto.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (York East): I am all for that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I could not help making these rather far-fetched comparisons. The hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) made a very eloquent plea on behalf of the farmers, but I can assure him there should be something done between the farms and the time the product gets into the restaurant. Somebody is taking a profit I think he is not entitled to.

AN hon. MEMBER: Too many get a little shade.

MR. MILLARD: Somebody takes a double hitch on us.

MR. COX: Somebody wants the stationery allowance

increased. That is all right with me, it would be only in comparison with the cost of the meals down here anyway.

These interesting observations may be of some interest, and let me repeat and reiterate, if you go down to Miami you will find the cost of living 25 to 50 percent. less than it is here in Toronto.

I do not know whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) has answered my question. Perhaps it is an imposition, but I started out with asking, with all the wonderful prospects which the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) pointed out, why in this fertile field are living costs so high here in Toronto?

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: We are trying to cure that.

MR. COX: I beg your pardon?

MR. KENNEDY: I am in agreement 100 percent., we are trying to cure that.

MR. COX: Oh, well, that is fine.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W.DENNISON (St. David): On Vote 1, Mr.Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr Kennedy) would tell us under what section of his Department the control of the Union Stockyards rests? Is there anything in the Estimates concerning the Union Stockyards?

MR. KENNEDY: No, but I could tell you about that.

MR. DENNISON: I would just like to draw the attention of the House to the fact the Union Stockyards Board purchased the stockyards for approximately $2,000,000., and there were 82 acres in the property involved; now they have sold a total of 23 acres for $161,000. I thought perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) might tell us just what the policy is. At first glance I am rather questioning the wisdom of selling that land, if it might be useful for future development.

MR. KENNEDY: The report which was tabled in the House about a month ago indicated what we are trying to do is sell the land to get buildings on it as quickly as possible. In taking over the stockyards, we had to take a lot of land with it, which we are now selling as quickly as possible.

We hope to have the last land sold very shortly.

MR. DENNISON: This is land you expect to have no use for?

MR. KENNEDY: No, it is housing land only.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) has the last report of the Stockyards Company been tabled in the House?

MR. KENNEDY: It was tabled about four weeks ago.

MR. SALSBERG: We shall see it in 1952.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, Item No. 8 of this Vote includes grants to the Royal Winter Fair for prizes. The hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) is quoted in the press as having given some encouragement to the "Royal", looking toward its further expansion. Is he in a position to say anything more about that?

MR. KENNEDY: I have not seen the paper today yet, but here is what I said yesterday: That Fair started 25 years ago, with a great vision, when the population around here was just about half what it is now. I saw people standing last year four deep watching that, and I think the time has come when they should enlarge it and have the same vision the people of 25 years ago had.

MR. DENNISON: May I just raise another point in connection with all our grants to fairs? I wonder if the government has ever thought of doing something to try to prevent the docking and nicking of the tails of horses which are exhibited in these fairs? I think it is a disgrace to see

mutilated horses being trotted around the ring. The House in Great Britain last year passed a Bill to prohibit the docking or nicking of horses' tails shown in exhibitions in Great Britain, and I think the time has come when this fad should be stepped on and prohibited here too. It does not add a bit to the beauty of a horse, in my opinion, it destroys the natural beauty of a horse to have its tail cocked up in the air.

MR. KENNEDY: That is exactly right. None of it is done in Ontario. It is done in the States and sometimes the animals are brought over.

Votes Nos. 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 5.

MR. T. H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Under Vote No. 5, Mr. Chairman, I notice a grant, it is here somewhere --

MR. MacLEOD: I believe the hon. member (Mr. Isley)is looking for vote No. 2, Community Centres?

MR. ISLEY: With respect to "Freight on Agricultural Lime", could the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) tell us how much lime is being distributed throughout Ontario, and which districts are using the most lime.

MR. KENNEDY: In every part of the province. The year before last we paid a subsidy on 25 million, and last year on 35 million -- I hear the Treasury talking about millions, I should say "thousands"; in 1948 we paid a subsidy on 25 thousand tons of agricultural lime; last year we paid subsidy on 35½ thousand, and hope to get that up this year.

MR. MILLARD: What are the principal sources of that lime?

MR. KENNEDY: It comes from different places, wherever it is closer -- Beachville, Dundas over here -- there are different places they buy it from.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): What is your subsidy based on?

MR. KENNEDY: Ottawa and ourselves go together and pay up to a dollar a ton on the mileage, so much on trucks, and so much on freight-cars, but not over a dollar unless it is far north or northwest. The average last year was just under the dollar.

MR. DENNISON: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) tell us how much approximately the price of lime has increased since the war?

MR. KENNEDY: I do not think it has increased any. It is remarkably cheap. What would I pay for loose lime from Dundas, Harry? You should know. A dollar a ton; and if you put it in bags it costs much more, but otherwise it is very cheap. The main cost is freighting it down.

MR. DENNISON: I would just like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to the fact that in the public accounts I notice about $8,000. of this subvention was paid to the American Cyanide Company at Welland. That is the famous company that the Rt. Hon. Mr. Howe-- I hope I will not arouse the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) -- Mr. Howe promised he was going to make that company available to the Federation of Agriculture if they wished to purchase it when the war was over, but that offer was withdrawn and the company was sold to an American firm which in the case of the fertilizer ammonium nitrate, has increased the price from $40. a ton, which was charged at the end of the war, to something in the vicinity of $80. a ton today. During the war the government produced that ammonium nitrate in that plant for $15. a ton. The point I am making, I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) might look into the question of whether or not we are subsidizing the profit of this company rather than helping the farmers under this system.

MR. KENNEDY: Not as far as the lime is concerned, because they get it for almost nothing.

MR. T. K. FOSTER (Bruce): I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to go back to the $100,000. item in Vote No. 3 under "junior farmer work". How is this money distributed to the Junior Farmer Associations throughout the province? Is it given through the agricultural representatives or to what effect, how is it got back to the various small individual organizations.

MR. KENNEDY: It is a long story. There are many, many different ways. I would suggest if you want it in detail -- I am not trying to dodge the question, but I know it would take half an hour to tell it exactly. If you go over and see "Dick" Hilliard, he will tell you exactly. We get into many different things in helping the junior farmer to become a better farmer.

MR. FOSTER: The reason I asked that question was that a few years back I was a member of a junior farmer organization myself.

MR. KENNEDY: That is the reason you are a good farmer.

MR. FOSTER: I served in that capacity, and I never knew at that time there was such a large proportion of assistance.

MR. KENNEDY: There was not then.

MR. FOSTER: There was not then, no, but today for the advantage of the younger boys coming along within my own county, I would like to see this money made available to the extent this government is providing it, and I was surprized when I saw the extent of money expended from the provincial government.

MR. KENNEDY: It goes into every county in the province.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr.Chairman, on Item 4 -- I will not press it if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) thinks it is not within the confines of that vote -- we are speaking of marketing branches and work to improve markets for Ontario products, but I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could say a few

words about the efforts, if any, that are made by the province toward the maintenance and improvement of our foreign markets for our agricultural products? Generally speaking, I think it is correct, and if I am mistaken, I stand to be corrected, that Ontario farmers sort of felt the loss of European markets, particularly the British, sooner than most other parts of the country. What if anything is being done to retain those markets?

MR. KENNEDY: As the hon. member (Mr.Salsberg) understands, foreign markets now are almost entirely in the hands of the dominion government. I have for many years asked Ottawa to let me have an experimental of 5,000,000 pounds of cheese and 5,000,000 pounds of bacon to experiment in the markets of the United States. When the time comes we want a new market, we know just where to send this premium bacon and cheese. They were tied up with a general agreement with the Empire and could not do it, but I hope when the English market is over -- or at least when the pound sterling and the dollars come together, we will be able to send farmers' organizations over to England to sell their own products there. We have organizations ready, I might say, to go to bat, we had them over in the States last summer, looking for new markets, and as soon as we get the "go" sign, we will do it. You were down to Agricultural Committee, and saw those committee groups. They are the people who are looking for new markets in other countries.

We have a splendid market south of us, and we will have a wonderful market in England one of these days.

MR. OLIVER: Does my hon. friend (Mr. Kennedy) know how much bacon went out of Ontario to the States last year?

MR. KENNEDY:You mean from the first of January?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, any time --

MR. KENNEDY: I do not think there is any from Ontario except one little contract that one of the firms had with the British Navy. We are short of bacon, as a matter of fact. You

see up in the north country where the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Leger) comes from, they are paying $30. for hogs. We have a little slaughtering plant and cold storage plant there -- and when I say "we", I mean the farmers -- there is an engineer there. You do not want to go "out on a limb" on this, but I do not believe we will come close to filling the bacon contract this year, because we are eating so much bacon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there any bacon going to the States at all?

MR. KENNEDY: Not at present. I will not waste the time of the House to tell a tale, but I have quite a tale to tell of Canadian bacon over in the United States. It is all Canadian bacon on the menu, but it is all fat, greasy stuff, fed by rancid oils, not the protein we have here, the fat we have, but with a fatty substance.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is the point I was going to raise. Over there they put "Canadian bacon" on the menu . It is not Canadian bacon.

MR. KENNEDY: No, it is not, but we can have good bacon on the menu over there.

Votes 5 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On Vote 8.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, under vote 8, is this a new branch, "Farm Labour Service Branch"?

MR. KENNEDY: Page 12?

MR. ISLEY: I suppose I was confused in the two -- last year's estimates. This is apparently a new branch. I have been trying to look it up.

MR. KEENEDY: It was the branch started when the war started, and we are getting it into a permanent position now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It did not appear as separate according to last year.

MR. KENNEDY: No, we are getting it now into permanent operation. It started at the start of the war and has been carried on. Ottawa pays half.

Votes 8 and 9 agreed to.

On vote 10.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is under item 7 that the subsidies are now being paid towards beef bulls. Is the federal government participating in that scheme?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We pay one-third up to $150., $75. when the bull is sold, and $75. in one year if the bull is kept in good shape.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I realize that. Is it the item shown here as "Grant to the Ontario Beef Cattle Improvement Association"? Because that is only $1,000.

MR. KENNEDY: We are trying to do everything through the farmers if we can, and keep it away from the government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: My point is that the grants to that Association is $1000. I take it that does not refer to the bull subsidy?

MR. KENNEDY: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where does it come in?

MR. KENNEDY; They do the sale work.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know, but what I am getting at is, what is the cost of the province of the beef bull subsidy?

MR. KENNEDY: This year, I am very happy to say, it is going to be high. This is one time I like to spend the money. We sold just under 200 bulls, and if you multiply that by $75 this year and $75 next, we paid almost $150 on every bull. Last year we did not, but this year, due to the quality of animal, we were able to pay all the subsidy. That is one I am glad to pay.

MR. OLIVER: Is there an estimate in here for that amount?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. OLIVER: Where do you find it?

MR. KENNEDY: Number 4 in livestock.

MR. FOSTER: I would ask the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) is this subsidy paid directly through the Toronto sale, or will it be the policy to go back through the various county sales held?

MR. KENNEDY: Not at present. There is representation being made there, but not at present. We are only in our second year of this, and it will be the greatest success we have ever anticipated. We do not know where we will end in this thing .

MR. MILLARD: To me, this is a little confusing, Mr. Chairman. In a previous estimate, Public Welfare, we saw an item last night which indicated it was paid by the Dominion government, and yet we were voting the amount here, that is the 75 per cent to be paid by the Dominion. You have just got done saying that in this Farm Labour Service, as an example, the Dominion government pays 50 per cent of the cost. Does that show here in the estimates?

MR. KENNEDY: Not in this estimate, but it does in line. In the line subsidy, we pay it all and Ottawa reimburses us 50 per cent, but in this item, that is not so.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Is there any provision in the livestock branch for assisting farmers to establish a herd of cattle or increase the herd they have, say in the newer parts of the province?

MR. KENNEDY: I beg your pardon?

MR. NEWMAN: Is there any provision made in any of the

estimates to assist the farmers to establish themselves, to start a beef cattle herd or a dairy cattle herd, or to give them any assistance in increasing their herds? Is there any provision made for that anywhere?

MR. KENNEDY: Not in giving any grants. The Ottawa government in your part of the country places out bulls, you know, and leaves them there. We pay freight up there.

MR. NEWMAN: Your part istto pay frieght, is it?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, up to northern Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The beef bull subsidy, though, is a form of assistance.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, we have that, but Ottawa is taking from Manitoulin and district north. They have a general policy throughout Canada that they will place bulls in certain parts of Canada and they may be used by the farmers of that locality. It is a splendid movement and one we endorse very heartily.

MR. FOSTER: Before leaving vote 10, I would like to ask a question on item 5, "expenses in connection with T.B. testing work, $75,000."; is that in conjunction with the federal government or where does the Ontario government enter into the picture?

MR. KENNEDY: We have an agreement with Ottawa, and all provinces have the same. Any part of a province which wants T.B. testing has to go to the provincial authorities, who investigate the situation and then recommend it to Ottawa and we then pay the expenses of all the chesters, and all the men employed, but they pay the salaries and also the indemnities for loss of animals.

MR. OLIVER: How many counties are being tested this year?

MR. KENNEDY: I think we have got them all now but

one or two. We would have had it all cleaned up if it were not for the shortage of veterinarians. The Dominion government wanted to clean it up but they could not get the men to do it.

Vote 10 agreed to.

On vote 11.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): May I ask how many members you have now on the Milk Control Board?

MR. KENNEDY: Three.

Vote 11 agreed to.

On vote 12.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I notice in this item, the last estimates, the last public account we have shows that under some item or subheading 3, there was an appropriation in 1948 - 1949 of $75,000., but there was voted an extra $645,000., or a total of $1,388,000. spent, this year, in this one item. There is a total of $700,000. approximately half of what was spent in the public account of 1948 - 1949.

The point I would like to make is that this item is put in the estimates along with 15 other items and this department seems to be the only department that handles its funds in that way, except perhaps the Department of Municipal Affairs in one or two cases. I have my eye on the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) there too.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): A lump sum, as it were.

MR. DENNISON: But the statement is made that this money for "agricultural works; clearing, breaking and draining of land; farm settlement; district veterinary services; grants and such other expenses necessary for the development of agriculture in northern Ontario, as may be directed by the Minister of Agriculture".

It seems to me that leaves the way open for an awfully hadny method --

MR. KENNEDY: You are very suspicious.

MR. DENNISON: -- for this government to gain political support by shifting grants around, particularly when there happened to be a by-election in the constituency. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact -- I did not take part in the Cochrane by-election, but I took a part in the Parry Sound by-election --

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): A complete failure, was it not?

MR. DENNISON: Well, now, that is just the point. Probably if that treasury board item of $440,000. had not been added you might not have been so successful in Parry Sound.

MR. KENNEDY: Oh, no.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to be assured by the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) this is not a "pork-barrel", that this is not being used, thrown around with special relationship to by-elections when the government are "ina pinch" sometime and want to get support. Honest to goodness, I never saw so much ditching going on in my life as I saw at Parry Sound when I was up there on that by-election, and the farmers told me there: "This is usual. This always happens when there is a by-election. The machines move in, the road machines --"

AN hon. MEMBER: They knew you were gullible.

MR. DENNISON: "Every department at Queen's Park comes up here when we have an election, and then after the election, you cannot find them anymore".

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): They knew you were a "city slicker", and they were just "kidding" you along.

MR. DUNBAR: They surely did not think you were that gullible.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, that condition should not prevail, and I would like to see the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) -- I suppose it is too late this year -- bring down his Estimates with these things specified as to what the vote is going to be, and take out that little item which permits him to tell the civil service where to throw it, where to put it, where to withdraw it, and so on. That really gives him a kingdom of control, the control of a good-sized monarchy in some of those European countries, which gives him a control of public moneys that I am afraid is too great a temptation for any hon. Minister, even the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to spend it under, when his "boys" demand help and assistance.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest there are too many of these things, there are 15 items here with that wording, that the "expenditure shall be as may be directed by the Minister of Agriculture".

MR. M. LEGER (Cochrane North): May I humbly suggest that the by-election in North Cochrane was held on June 8th, and if you have ever been up north, sir, you will find that is not the time of year when ploughing or ditching can be done.

In addition to that, I submit that in North Cochrane riding, 1948 was the year when the least clearing and breaking was done, and the smallest amount of ditching was done.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: We do not have to dig ditches to get our men elected.

MR. DENNISON: Sometimes you might find it handy.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr.Chairman, I was going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) a somewhat similar question, but in a little different form. I notice the sum of $670,000.

for northern Ontario, a substantial sum, I want to congratulate the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy).

I was going to ask -- and perhaps you have not the details -- if there is a breakdown available so one might have some idea as to how much might be expended in the respective areas, and that publicized place at the Lakehead in particular. Naturally I would like to know how much might be available.

I do not anticipate any by-elections such as my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) spoke about, but I would never think for a moment, the Conservatives would exercise any political patronage. They are never accused of that.

MR. MacLEOD: Oh, that would never occur to them.

(Take H-1 follows)

MR. COX: I do not think there is going to be a by-election. If there was, the Conservatives would not be elected, so there is no point at all in having one. I was only asking if the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) had the figures.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. COX: Give us the breakdown, so we will nowwhow much you are spending there.

MR. KENNEDY: It is broken down into districts. I want to say this most earnestly, and I hope every hon. member will believe me when I say that never one copper of this money was ever even thought of having any politics in it.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: There are several departments which have to be kept out of politics, and mine is one of them. I would not get anywhere in the province of Ontario, if the people thought my department was in politics.

MR. MILLARD: Can you give assurance in regard to the hon. minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) of the same thing.

MR. DOUCETT: I can assure you of that.

MR. KENNEDY: We assisted 2,487 settlers; we cleaned 15,115 acres, and we broke 13,376 acres. That was right from Kenora to the south.

We paid in subsidies for that, $247,672.70. We did 223.1 miles of grading, at a total cost of $401,048.54; some 1,013 farms were benefitted, and 97,387 acres were graded.

May I say to the hon. members that this vote is leaving my department. It is going to the department of [illegible]

Public Works, where it belongs. I am not in the contracting business. The hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) has his engineers up there, and his machinery. This has been a pet subject of mine since I was minister before, in 1930. I have always felt that the settlers in the north country had much more coming to them than any government so far has given to them. This vote was then put under my direction, so the farms could be cleaned up, and the farmers could make money on them. As it is now they have to leave the farms and work in the woods, and also the pulp mills. The time has come when we must see that they grow enough to feed themselves up there.

It may interest you to know that we are doing that. We are getting farmers now to put all their time on the farm and build up a home for the children.

This vote now goes to the Department of Public Works, and you can question the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) about that $700,000. I have never seen a vote changed in this house, but may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if we could change this to the Department of Public Works.

MR. FROST: Oh, be careful. You might get it into politics, if you do that.

MR. KENNEDY: I do not believe in always going by the rules. I like to break precedents now and then. The hon. Prime Minister thinks we could not do that?

MR. FROST: No.

MR. COX: If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am very grateful indeed to the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy), and I can assure him that the settlers in the district

I represent are very appreciative of what was done last year.

But I was asking the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) for a break-down with respect to certain districts.

MR. KENNEDY; We have that, but I have not got it here. I can give it to you, because we allotted so much to Kenora, and so much to Rainy River, and so much to your district, before the thing started.

MR. F. OLIVER (Grey South): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) send a copy of the break-down to every hon. member of the House.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, I will be very pleased too.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman? When we were on the trip up north, one of the most interesting things I saw was a great power plow they have up there which I understand is able to clear approximately an acre an hour.

MR. KENNEDY: Ten acres a day.

MR. MacLEOD: I understand the Department makes $18.50 per acre; is that right?

MR. KENNEDY: I do not think so.

MR. MacLEOD: That is what I am told, by the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Leger).

MR. KENNEDY: That is clearing and breaking, both.

MR. MacLEOD: This means that the man who is farming up there has to pay about $10.00 himself; is that correct? $10.00 or a little better? In view of the fact that it is a new country which does not have some of the attractions,. at least-- the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) may

disagree with this-- but let us say it does not have the advantages of the more settled parts of the province, do you not think it would be a good idea for the Department to agree to assume the whole cost of clearing land there, in order to give the man a chance to put up his buildings and his home? As it stands now, he is paying a little better than $10.00. Why do you not take care of the whole business?

MR. KENNEDY: No. I spoke earlier about "climbing hills". We have climbed the hill there and it is now under Public Works, and I am leaving that hill for the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) to climb.

MR. MacLEOD: Since this is going over to the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett), and inasmuch as he has been head of the "Department of Winning Friends and Influencing People" for the past seven years, I feel sure when the vote shifts to him, he will take up the suggestion, and add a few friends, and influence more people.

MR. COX: I would like to make one more remark. I would like to ~~c~~ letet the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) know that the utmost satisfaction prevails in connection with the land clearing in that particular district.

Vote No. 13 Carried.

On Vote No. 14.

MR. MILLARD: We passed to No. 14 pretty rapidly.

I have had occasion to look into this question of the Women's Institutes in recent years, and while it seems to me the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) has a long and honourable

record of organization, and has done some very important work in the countryside of Ontario, it does seem to me that under this department-- the human economics of the Department of Agriculture-- sufficient progress in that regard is not being made.

I cannot put my finger on the reason for it, but it seems to me that 44,000 members, approximately-- as shown in the book issued by the Department-- for the Women's Institute-about 44,000 throughout Ontario is not, after all, a very large percentage of the farm population, represented by the Women's Institute.

I was wondering if more attention cannot be given by way of a program and assistance to this very important group of people.

One thing, Mr. Chairman, I notice in the Hand Book of the Women's Institute, when I was preparing a short talk for them, was this rather antiquated idea that there should be no politics. I quite agree that there should be no partisan politics, but it seems to me it is a little bit unrealistic today if the women are going to understand the kind of world they are living in, and some of the great political issues which are confronting us, at home and abroad-- that these matters are not made available to them. There is nothing, it seems to me, that so effects women in their kitchens, and in their organizations, and in their home life, the training of the junior women for home life, and the development of families on the farm-- then that they should know some of the political ramifications of the world in which we live.

I am just wondering if some more attention could not be given to this particular department, and some greater encouragement to the women to expand their organization.

In the first place, it seems to me that their dues or their financial structure is very weak indeed, and they do not have the money necessary to carry on local activities to the extent they should. I am hoping that this combination of community centres and Women's Institute, could be greatly strengthened in the coming year.

I do not know whether this can be done under the amount which has been estimated here, but I do certainly suggest to the government that just a little bit more encouragement and emphasis be put on this particular department.

In this day and age, 44,000 organized farm women I do not think is enough, in Ontario. I think we should have far more than that, and I think they should broaden out their program, so they can see the implications of politics on their home life.

Page H-7 follows.

And I think they should know something about the political issues of the world in which we are living. Because, after all, if we get into another war, and so on, all these questions will vitally affect them, and I think they should know more about it.

MR. KENNEDY: I might say the Women's Institute itself resents very seriously any governmental interference. I have offered them more money, and then they think they are going into politics. I do not think any hon. member of this knows how careful the Minister of Agriculture has to walk when he goes through the country. I go to an organization every year, not so much to speak, as to listen to what they are saying, a local one, a county one, a district one, and finally a general one. In every case they say, "We want to run our own business in our own way".

I will not climb this hill, but I will say that we have one woman in each four counties as a demonstrator for women in those counties. They are doing a wonderful job. Seven years ago we had one woman in every ten counties; now it is one in four counties, and we hope in a short time it will be one in three counties, and then one in two. Our goal is to have one in every county.

MR. MILLARD: Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) explain Item 5?

MR. KENNEDY: That is in regard to a Miss Grey, who came into the service 45 years ago. In the old days, they got $2. a day, and they were used day by day. In 1931 and 1932 I put some of them on the permanent staff, but this lady was too old to go on the permanent staff; she had given 40 years of her life to the service, and I think perhaps the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail) may know her, she is one of the best beloved ladies in the province of Ontario. She worked under hard conditions throughout rural Ontario, and she did not get

any gratuities or bonus for it, and she was too old in 1932 to go on the permanent staff. I thought it would be a nice gesture to make this little contribution to her.

MR. MILLARD: Is this a yearly grant?

MR. KENNEDY: No, a special grant.

MR. MILLARD: It is not very much.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) was speaking about the Women's Institute, there is something I want to say. I think they have done a wonderful job in the community. In fact, I think women can do more with 25 cents than a man can do with a dollar. It is amazing the good work they have done in the way of community halls, and the development of the youth of the communities, the beautification of the rural communities and so forth. I think a great deal of praise is due to them.

On the point of keeping politics out, that is a hard thing to do. There we are really going back, Mr. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to the days of the U.F.W.O. -- the United Farm Women of Ontario -- who always said they could talk about anything they wanted to, but the Institute women were restricted. There was a lot of truth in that. Now, there is not a great deal of difference between the federated women of Ontario, because the federation too, has got so holy that they will not touch politics.

(Take I-1 follows)

It is soon going to be no one in the Chamber knows anything about politics because nobody will find anything about it - I mean in theory, that is to say, in practice it is not.

We have the Federated Farm Women, they do not talk politics, and the Institute of Women is for "home and country". Home and country today without an understanding of politics, is just nonsense. We cannot understand either the home or the country unless you understand political implications.

I used to think the women were always aware of where they get their grants and so were a little fearful of launching on any subject that might be thought to be political, and yet in county institutes they have often asked me to address them, which shows they have some daring. We got along very well, I was very careful never to touch on any partisan subject, but you could not make a speech, Mr. Chairman, about big issues, without being political in part.

I think country women are fully aware of that fact, and I hope their department will do whatever they can to lift this limitation -- you know, "for home and country, but it must be non-political".

The Federation is working for the benefit of the farmer, but it must be non-political. It is just nonsense, and they all know it. Of course if things get "tough", I think they will soon find out they have to take politics whether they want to or not, but I feel I would not be doing my duty by the country women whom I know so well if I did not say the Institute has done a realy find job, and I wish there were twice that $44,000.

I was, for many years, a member of the Institute as well as the member of the U.F.W.O. and the Federation Farm Women, because I felt that by belonging to both I was getting

the point of view of different groups of women, some of them primarily interested in politics, some of them not interested at all, yet if they are good institute workers, they finally come to see -- any women I have ever talked to, anyway -- that women must have an understanding of politics in the broad sense. I am not now talking about partisan politics.

I am a suspicious creature, Mr. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) and I have always been a little afraid that too large grants from the government have a certain influence on institutes and on junior farmers.

MR. KENNEDY: Human nature is the same.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not think the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy)wants it. After all, he is my favourite minister.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Peterborough): What?

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes. You are in the "dog h use" over that picture that appeared here.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: That is all I want to say, that I feel any grant which comes from the government comes from the people of Ontario, it does not come from the government, the government itself has not the money, in fact they have not much money, I am all for giving them $2000. each more than they are getting, that is the Treasury bench fellows. That is money which belongs to the people of Ontario, the grants, and I do not think there should be any tie, I do not think the Women's Institute or Junior Farmers should feel obligated to restrict their decisions to entirely non-partisan subjects, because if they do, they are living in an unreal world, they are not talking about the world as we know it today.

I hope therefore, the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) will liberate these grants so everybody who receives them

will feel they are still a free individual.

HON. W. E. HAMILTON (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, as one who had the opportunity to attend as a guest the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Women's Institute at Guelph the other summer, I could not help but be impressed by the virility of the movement and the fact it has spread all over the world. I rather feel they have developed a sound basis of operation, that they manage their own affairs well.

Votes 15 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

On vote 18.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, last year I spoke at some length during estimates about the O.A.C. and the O.V.C. I am not going to do that this year, I just want to issue an invitation to the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy)

In connection with the estimates here shown for the OA.A.C. totalling I believe at little over $2,100,000. is it not a fact that appropriation is offset to some extent by the revenues of the college and the farm operated in connection with the college? I do not know any exact figures, but my impression is it is in the neighbourhood of $600,000. or $700,000.

MR. KENNEDY: A little more, I think. I will give it to you in the meantime.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What I am getting at is, I think it should be made clearer to people who are interested in this matter, that -- and the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) will correct me if I am wrong, but this is the way I understand it -- the net cost of this institution to the Treasury of Ontario is not over $2,000,000., but very substantially less.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am correct in that statement, am I not?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, you are.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In fact, it is much more like a million and a quarter, or there abouts.

MR. KENNEDY: One million, three hundred thousand.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The net cost is perhaps one million, three hundred thousand or one million, four hundred thousand.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE; That I think ought to be made clear. My only other comment is that I think it is extraordinaryly economical to get as much for your dollars as you are getting from the O.A.C. with that appropriation.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, there is a matter under vote 18 I think should be referred to here, because I have never seen any comments of the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) on it, and it is rather a serious matter which I am sure he would not want to allow to pass unnoticed.

MR. KENNEDY: Do not be too sure of that.

MR. MacLEOD: Wait until you hear it. This is an item that appeared in the Toronto Star on the 26th January, headline Kitchener, and the caption on the story is as follows:

"Colleges Professors and Staff at O.A.C. Politically Bossed."

Then it goes on to say:

"Stating that his own entry into the Civil

Service was accomplished purely through his association with a political party unnamed, Robert C. Pettigrew of the Puslinch Chamber of Commerce, said here yesterday that he received the position without particular regard for other qualifications. Mr. Pettigrew is a retired civil servant.

The speaker charged that professors of the staff at the Ontario Agricultural College in Guelph are often afraid of speaking out in case they offend some of their political bosses. Pettigrew said he believes the political boss setup leaves a cloud over the heads of the college staff and they are not in a position to offer their best to the province.

Now listen:

"M. M.Betzner of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture backed up Mr. Pettigrew and said: "I believe it would add dignity to the college to be under a separate board of governors"." --

and so on. That is the substance of the article which appeared in the Toronto press on the 26th of January. I watched to see, as I expected a sharp reaction on the part of the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) especially since it has been argued many times in the House that O.A.C. should be divorced from the Department of Agriculture, and now the committee headed by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) has proposed such a course, I do not know how rapidly it will proceed. I think it would be a very good thing,

I think it would be a very good thing, since this charge was made by a former member of the Civil Service, in view of the nature of the charge, if the hon. minister (Mr. Kennedy) issued to the House. --

MR. KENNEDY: I will do that right as soon as you sit down.

MR. MacLEOD: But do not make it too brief. Do not say: "The answer is in the negative", as you did last year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Is there anything to this?

MR. KENNEDY: Not a word, in any shape or form. Let me say that never in my life in my connection with O.A.C. did I use one bit of politics, and I never will as long as I am minister. Never will.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: Every recommendation comes down there without any endorsement from the president of the different organizations, and goes to my Deputy Minister, and homes from him to me, and I never rejected or added one to it, and I want to say that, not in one word, but if I said it twenty times I could not make it stronger.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you know this man?

MR. KENNEDY: My man, you could not be in my position, with a love of the college such as I have, and do anything to hurt it. You could not do it. If any politics come in there -- and I would say this about other ministers, with the exception of one hon. minister, such a conception of that college has been completedy out of politics by all ministers of both Liberal and Conservative parties.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: You understand now I just raised this

point because it appeared in the public press.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: I am not suggesting for a moment that has any substance whatsoever, but I think you will feel grateful to me for giving you the opportunity of giving the House the assurances you have given and -- may I finish -- do you know anything about that man?

MR. KENNEDY: No, never heard of him.

(Page I-8 follows)

Hon. W. E. HAMILTON (Minister of Reform Institutions): A retired federal civil servant, who lived in Hamilton, spent the major portion of his career with the Department of Post Office in the City of Hamilton, bought a farm in Puslinch, and retiring about two years ago, so he must have entered the service all of 40 years ago, and possibly conditions may have been that way when he entered.

MR. MacLEOD: Very good, I will let it pass, and may I just repeat again what I said last year, that I hope when the O.A.C. does have a Board of Governor of its own and is functioning as an entirely independent institution, that its first act will be to confer an honorary Doctorate of Agronomy on the present hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: You are forgiven for everything you have said now.

(Take J-1 follows)

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without portfolio): May I say just a word on this subject? In those days, when Mr. Ferguson was looking for a president for the O.A.C., he selected a man from my own town, one with whom I grew up, a man who had gone to an agricultural college in the United States, and I know that during his tenure of office as president of the O.A.C., he did not play politics in any sense of the word. In fact, I never heard any criticism of him during his tenure of office -- I never heard a word of criticism against Dr. George Christie. He certainly was not of the same political party, as the man who appointed him, the hon. Mr. Howard Ferguson.

I wish to pay tribute to both of these gentlemen in that regard.

Vote 19 agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

MR. MacLEOD: Are we going to have a discussion on rural hydro?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, that is coming.

MR. FROST: We can call it six o'clock, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) can come on after eight. We will hold the "big guns" until after dinner.

THE CHAIRMAN: It now being six o'clock, the Committee do rise.

- - - -

It being six of the clock, the Committee took recess.

- - -

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege again to present to this House a report on the affairs of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for 1949.

In proportion to its population no large country is more blessed with natural resources than Canada, and no province within the Dominion is more favoured than Ontario.

Our vast forests and fertile fields, our mountains of minerals and extensive network of highways, our health climate and magnificent scenery, provide an encouraging environment for our energetic and resourceful people.

In order to make best use of these resources, we have developed through the past four decades an adequate supply of low-priced dependable power, based on the rivers of our well-watered land.

Years ago one of Canada's most distinguished statesmen said "The twentieth century belongs to Canada". We have now nearly reached the half-way mark and a glance backward for the past fifty years reveals, in material progress, an almost incredible advance. Certainly in this province we are building an industrial empire of no mean proportions.

Since the beginning of the century,-- a period during which the population of the province has just abour doubled, having now passed the four million mark -- Ontario's industrial production has increased in value from $241,000,000 to a production which it is estimated reached in 1949 a value of $5,500,000,000. Most noteworthy is the increase that has taken place during the past ten years. In 1939, the recorded value was $1½ billion, equivalent to a value of $471 per capita of population. In 1949, the per capita figure had reached $1,375.

The total value of mineral production in Ontario has been equally striking; the increase in the period from 1900 to 1948 was from $11¼ million to nearly $300 million. Fifty years ago the great Hydro undertaking of Ontario existed only in the thoughts of a few of its citizens; today it serves the whole province. In 1900 the waterpower developed in all Ontario was less than the capacity of one of the two units at the new plant at DeCew Falls, or of the new Stewartville plant on the Madawaska river. In 1949 the installed capacity of hydraulic turbines in the province was approximately 3,000,000 horsepower with another 1,000,000 horsepower under construction.

Recent expansion can be illustrated by the record of the consumption of electricity since just before the war. In 1939 the total energy available to the Commission, both generated and purchased, for use in the province was 7,600 million kilowatt-hours. In 1949 this figure reached 13,365 million kilowatt-hours. It is interesting to note that the kilowatt-hour demand for power has about doubled in the past ten years and on February 21 of this year the all-time high demand for the day reached 36,976,000 kilowatt-hours, compared with the high mark of a year ago, when it reached 35,513,000 kilowatt-hours.

The Commission's Construction Program

To meet the increasing demand for power for industry, homes, stores and farms, and provide an adequate reserve, has been the major problem facing the Commission since the end of the war. This year we look back upon a period of unprecedented achievement in the construction field. During the past twelve months work was carried forward simultaneously at no less than five new hydro-electric developments representing a total power production capacity of 784,000 kilowatts, or approximately

1,050,000 horsepower.

During the current year the great development at Des Joachims will commence to deliver power; indeed it is anticipated that six at least of the eight units will be in operation before the end of the year, and that the whole development will be completed early in 1951.

On the Nipigon river the great development at Pine Portage will augment hydro services in the Thunder Bay system during 1950, contribute to the load for the lake-head cities and to the power pools of the pulp and paper, and mining industries.

In the northeastern region the spectacular tunnel development in a deep canyon on the Mississagi river is nearing completion and later in the year power from this unit will be aiding the mining and municipal needs of north-eastern Ontario.

Shortages of rainfall over extensive areas of Ontario and Quebec during the past two years have emphasized the desirability of providing as an insurance measure electric steam stations which can be used to advantage during emergency and peak periods. During the past year a start was made on the two largest steam electric projects ever undertaken in Canada--the Windsor and Toronto steam generating stations, which will have a combined capacity of 320,000 kilowatts, or 428,000 horsepower.

Power developments in faraway places are not the entire solution of power shortages. They must be connected to areas where the power is needed, by long transmission lines and ancillary equipment, such as large transformer stations, and in some cases frequency converters. Since the inauguration of its post-war $580,000,000 program the Commission has built more than

350 route miles of 230,000-volt transmission line and nearly 900 route miles of 115,000-volt line. During 1950 this business of linking up its new power projects with sonsumer areas will be carried on at a still more rapid pace towards the program objective of 1,320 route miles of 230,000-volt line and 1,570 route miles of 115,000-volt line. Associated with this hydro expansion line construction is the building of a number of transformer stations at strategic locations.

Program for 1950

The present economic situation (in its broad outline) suggests that power demands will continue to increase during 1950. There has been some decline in the demand from heavy industry, but home construction is expected to continue at a high level and new industries established during the past few years are building up to their planned capacity output.

Phenomenal growth in rural service and increased mining activity all point to continued load growth. No decline in wages is foreseen, nor any major change in material prices. It is hoped, however, that increased productivity and more active competition in manufacturing may contribute to the lowering of certain costs of the hydro construction program.

The budget expenditure for the current fiscal year, as part of the Commission's post-war program, is established at $162,570,000. A break-down of the program for work approved or contemplated is as follows:

	Mar. 30.
Generation (hydro-electric)	$ 59,600,000
Generation (steam-electric)	24,500,000
Transmission	26,000,000
Transformation	27,100,000
Rural	17,270,000
Communications	2,000,000
Frequency standardization - H.E.P.C.	2,300,000
New buildings - Cons. Eng. division	3,800,000
Total	$162,570,000
Deductible from stores account	6,570,000
1949-1950 budget expenditure	$156,000,000

Whilst the construction of new power developments and transmission facilities was the main concern of hydro in 1949, and will continue to dominate its activities during 1950, there are other matters of importance to which I should like briefly to refer.

Rural construction

The rural consttuction program for the current fiscal year calls for a total expenditure of $17,270,000, including the government grant-in-aid of $8,335,000. Part of this program is a carry-over from 1948-1949, for which the grant-in-aid proportion of $3,250,000 has already been voted. In all, the Commission plans to complete 1,825 miles of rural line extension, to which 4,480 consumers will be connected, and to add 26,837 consumers to existing lines.

During the six year period 1944 to 1949 the Commission spent $49½ million on rural extensions and improvements including additional districution capacity, of which the government grant-in-aid exceeded $24½ million. This more than doubles the capital expenditures and grants made up to 1943.

Frequency standardization

The decision to standardize the frequency of the southern Ontario system at 60 cycles, to conform to the frequency generally prevailing elsewhere in Canada and throughout the United States, was reached in 1948. The organization of a department of the Commission for this work was started in August of that year. During the past 18 months, to the end of February this year, the following has been accomplished by the Commission and its contractor.

> 12,301 consumers have been changed to 60 cycles. These comprise 11,444 domestic consumers, 698 commercial consumers and 159 power consumers. 22,572 kilowatts (30,096 horsepower) of demand have been changed to 60 cycles.

The estimated number of consumers whose equipment will be changed over to the end of December 1950 is 85,326, comprising 77,916 domestic, 6,376 commercial and 1,034 power.

The inventories taken in connection with the change-over show a high average number of appliances per home in Ontario and indicate that in the utilization of electrical home equipment the stand of living in Ontario is high.

In addition to the change-over of consumer equipment, which is being done under the direction of the Frequency Standardization division, the Electrical Engineering department of the Commission is responsible for the conversion of the Commission's plants from 25 cycles to 60 cycles where needed, and the conversion of municipal systems when requested by the municipalities. So far more than 150 municipalities have requested assistance from the Commission in standardizing their equipment.

The Commission's technical personnel are alwayw searching

for means to facilitate standardization of consumer equipment and many valuable contributions have been made to the solution of various problems.

This frequency standardization being carried out over a long-term period in southern Ontario is one of the most complicated enterprises ever undertaken in Canada, demanding painstaking planning, skilful engineering, exact timing and a goodly amount of what our American friends call "know how". That this program is proceeding with a minimum of inconvenience is a tribute to all concerned, including the consumers themselves.

Higher Costs for New Construction

Later on I shall have something to say regarding the effect increased costs have upon thecost of power to the municipalities and the rates to consumers.

At this point I wish to call attention to the actual increase in labourand material costs that the Commission has had to face in carrying out its immense post-war construction program and also to show where money for the construction program has been and is being spent, and some of the larger items which enter into the program.

In a small tabulation I have here the relative costs for the years 1939, 1947 and 1949. These relative costs are based upon an index of 100 for labour in the general manufacturing industry of Canada, in 1949.

I will quote the index figures of 1939, 1947 and 1949 in that order.

Item	Relative costs 1939	1947	1949 (Latest Data)
Labour			
Construction Wage Earnings....	103	170	202
Manufacturing Industry.....	100	183	224
Electrical Apparatus Industry.	100	195	252
Materials			
Building and Construction materials.....	89	166	202
Iron and Non-ferrous Metals and Products.....	89	133	163
Copper, Brass and Products....	77	136	146
Cement.....	96	110	127
Lumber and Timber.....	94	219	280
Cost of Construction	102	165	197

Purchases during 1949

During 1949 the Hydro-Electric Power Commission purchased materials and equipment to a total of approximately $100,000,000. Of this sum $81,250,000 was spent in Ontario; $5,550,000 was spent in Canada other than Ontario; $8,750,000 was spent in the United Kingdom and $4,500,000 was spent in the United States.

The great bulk of the $8,750,000 spent in the United Kingdom was on account of the turbine-generators for the Toronto steam plant and the Windsor steam plant.

Regarding the $4,500,000 spent in the United States, some $3,770,000 was spent for emergency equipment and $250,000 was spent to take care of particular types of equipment already installed in Canadian homes and plants being standardized to 60 cycles.

In the aggregate the Commission's construction program

and the frequency standardization project require a tremendous volume of equipment and materials. The following are a few examples of the amount spent during 1949 on various items:

	Total expenditure for 1949
Hydraulic Turbines: Two firms.....	$ 1,792,867
Hydraulic Generators: One firm.....	3,557,704
Steam Turbine Generator Units: Nine firms..	13,610,529
Power Transformers: Nine firms.....	3,308,491
Oil Circuit Breakers: Four firms...	1,143,828
Cement: Three firms.....	3,242,769

May I just digress here for a moment. I wish to say, in 1949, Ontario purchased 192 thousand barrels of cement for our work which was only 10 per cent of the output of cement companies in the Dominion of Canada in order to relieve the cement shortage in Ontario. We purchased in Alberta some 192 thousand barrels so when it is said that we were responsible for the cement shortage, just keep in mind that we only used about 10 per cent of the total output of cement companies in Canada.

(AA-10 follows)

Reinforcing Steel: Five firms..... 505,278

Tower Steel: Two firms..... 3,022,707

Copper Wire: Ten Firms..... 2,774,809

Aluminum Wire: Four firms..... 2,967,276

The volume of material to be transported to the sites of the Commission's new developments and the large size of certain portions of the generating units involve problems of very great magnitude. These may perhaps be appreciated when it is understood that it requires 22 flat railway cars to deliver one 60,000-horsepower generator--and we are purchasing eight -- to the Des Joachims development.

Is There Danger of Over-development

Doubting Thomases have again raised their heads, questioning the soundness of the development program that the Commission has under way and throwing doubt upon the continuance of the great expansion in demand that has taken place since the war. The important consideration, and I know it is one that weighs heavily with those responsible for providing for the future is, not that we do not know that the power will be required as planned for, but that we do not know that it will not be required. We do know, however, that there are certain things for which we must provide.

First of all, we must have a working margin of capacity to enable us at all times and under all eventualities to meet the primary peak demand. Under the immense loads now being carried by the Commission this margin in itself, represents a substantial investment in generating capacity. Secondly, we must provide for an anticipated growth in the demands of existing consumers -- domestic, commercial, a multiplicity of small industries served by the municipalities, and a great growth in

the rural load resulting from three factors,--the extension of services into more remote areas, the tremendous increase in consumers now being connected to existing lines and the rapid increase in individual demands. It is of interest to note that the aggregate rural load served in 1949 exceeded the aggregate load of the ten Ontario cities of : Brantford, Guelph, Kitchener, Oshawa, Owen Sound, Peterboro, Port Arthur, St.Catharines, Sarnia and Sudbury. Finally we must provide for the large possible growth in loads of large new industries.

Those of us on this side of the House have faith in the future growth of the Province and willnot see the Province short of power. The Commission recognizes that over-development may be costly, but from the broad viewpoint of provincial economy, under-development would be disastrous. To some extent the provision of electric power beyond a certain point may be looked upon in the nature of wise insurance.

Niagara Water Diversion

In respect to the Niagara River diversions, after almost two years of effort a Treaty to permit a greatly increased diversion of water for power has been signed by both countries, and now awaits ratification. To a large degree this Treaty would make permanent and formalize diversions arranged during war time by temporary agreements.

Prime Minister Leslie M. Frost, the Honourable L.B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, His Excellency, Mr. H. Hume Wrong, Canadian Ambassador to the United States and members of their staffs, co-operated with the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario throughout the negotiations. On behalf of the Commission I desire to acknowledge their most valuable assistance.

The new Treaty makes as a basic requirement abundant

safeguards for the scenic beauty and crest protection of the Falls; in fact it provides for a minimum flow over the Falls changing with the seasons and hours of the day. The balance of water is available for power purposes. Over the minimum scenic requirements Canada has; first, the right to use the 5,000 cubic feet per second diverted from the Ogoki and Kenogami rivers to the Great Lakes basin, and second, fifty per cent of the balance. It is the Commission's intention to proceed immediately with the preliminary steps which will lead to actual work at the site, which should start when found necessary after ratification. The new Treaty will promote a more efficient use of the water of the river and permit immediate construction of a new development in the vininity of Queenston with a capacity of approximately 500,000 horsepower.

The ultimate scheme for the re-development of the power available to Ontario, using the water in the most efficient manner, will result in a total increase of power available from the Niagara river for Ontario of well over 800,000 horsepower.

St. Lawrence River Power Development

The Commission regrets that the 2,200,000 horsepower available on the St. Lawrence, one-half of which if developed would benefit Ontario, should remain unutilized. The history of the desired economic development of the St. Lawrence river is largely a record of frustrating moves in one form or another, of continual postponement of this worthwhile and necessary project.

It does not matter much what the reason or what the method. The simple fact to the people of northeastern United States and eastern Canada is that, as it was (first) in 1934 when the United States Senate refused to ratify the treaty--which had been signed at Washington in July, 1932, had been

approved by the United States Foreign Relations Committee in 1933, and which had the support of Canada; -- and again as it was (second) following 1941, when a series of moves failed to secure definite action on the power project,--it being claimed that this project must be approved by means of a treaty;--so it was (third) in 1948 when the statement was made that the whole St. Lawrence Seaway project would be resubmitted to Congress in 1949, and therefore it would be "inappropriate" for the Government to submit the New York State application to the International Joint Commission, and on this plea the request to do so was refused. By this actionthe project was again indefinitely stalled. Thus there have been many times when there was plenty of action but no agreement and other times where there was harmonious agreement but no action.

Surely when it comes to the question of developing the St. Lawrence river, the interests of Ontario and the adjacent states should predominate over farway places. You may rest assured that the Commission will continue its efforts to secure permission to proceed with the development of the River's power resources, in co-operation with the State of New York, or any other United States group.

Future Costs of Power to Municipalities and Future Rates to Consumers

Earlier in this discussion I referred to the higher costs incurred in the construction of new power developments. Obviously these higher costs must be reflected in the wholesale cost of power - to the municipalities, to the rural operating areas, to the system customers of the Commission and to the customers of the Northern Ontario Properties.

To understand not merely the inevitability of an increase in the cost of power, but the magnitude of the increase, it is

necessary to have some understanding of the principal underlying wholesale power charges and the method of billing municipalities and other customers for power.

To the urban municipalities of the Southern Ontario and Thunder Bay systems The Hydro-Electric Power Commission supplies power under the general policy of service at cost. This policy is incorporated in the contracts with the municipalities and these municipalities are referred to as "Cost Contract Municipalities".

Cost includes not only all operating and maintenance charges, interest on investment and reserves for depreciation, obsolescence and contingencies, and other special items, but also a reserve for sinking fund or capital repayments.

As actual power cost cannot be determined until the end of the year, the cost is estimated for municipal billing purposes and an interim rate is established. There is, therefore, always an adjustment to be made, commonly referred to as "the 13th bill", which is usually a refund or credit to the municipality. To facilitate accounting practice it has been customary to set the interim rate at a level which would normally produce a credit balance at the end of the year. In 1949, for example, the aggregate sum refunded to the municipalities amounted to about $1,203,000. There are, of course, many factors which arise during the year to increase or decrease the final credit or debit adjustment for the year.

The basic fact to keep in mind is that the municipalities are obligated to pay the cost of supplying the power to them, and the actual cost as determined at the end of the year is the important feature, not the interim rate which is simply a process adopted to facilitate monthly billing.

Factors which influence the wholesale cost of power, and

will determine its magnitude during the coming years, are quite complex. We have already seen that the Commission is increasing its power resources by a very large construction program at a time of high costs. When this construction program is completed about one-third of the Commission's total power resources will be derived from power developments constructed under high-cost conditions. Fortunately, however, for the Hydro enterprise rather more than one-third of the power resources at the end of this constrcution period will still come from the Commission's own generating plants as existing before the war, which were built under conditions of relatively low cost, subsequently reduced by capital repayments incorporated in the cost of power. A further large section of the power resourc es will consist, and will continue to consist, of purchased power derived from favourable long-term contracts, also arranged in the pre-war period. The annual capital charges, therefore, for the total power resources following the completion of the new power developments must be a combination of the annual charges relating to these three groups.

The general cost of power, however, will also be influenced in the future by higher costs of operation and maintenance and these factors will, of course, apply to all the generating plants operated by the Commission, both old and new. There are other factors which enter into the picture, such for example as the present lower cost of money.

The net result of the foregoing considerations is that the new wholesale cost of power to the customers of the Commission will increase, but not by any means in proportion to the increased cost of new developments at the present time.

Municipal Rates to Consumers

By-and-large the prices charged by the municipalities

in their rates for service to their domestic, commercial and power consumers over a period of years, are adjusted to reflect the principle of service at cost. This end is attained not as a rule by refunds to individual customers, although this is sometimes done, but mainly by an adjustment of rate schedules to bring in a revenue annually sufficient to meet the cost.

It is obvious, therefore, that with increased wholesale costs for power supplied by the Commission, the municipalities must adjust their retail rates. In additon, however, to the higher cost of wholesale supply, the local Commissions are faced with higher operating and maintenance costs within their own distribution organizations. It will, therefore, be necessary for the municipalities in most cases to adjust their rates.

There is a very important factor which will have to be taken into consideration, both in the matter of wholesale prices for power and in the adjustment of retail rates.

The new loads taken on by the Commission and the municipalities, as the result of increased industrial development and population growth, will first produce a revenue roughly corresponding to the cost of supplying service, but increased energy use by both new and existing consumers is very largely use at the follow-up or lower energy rates. A great deal of the new power developed by the Commission at high costs will be sold in the lowest rate brackets for energy. This fact will impose many difficult problems to be solved in the essential rate adjustments that must be made within the next few years, as new power supplies are combined with the old.

This trend is clearly indicated by comparing the central station income from Domestic Consumers for the years 1939 to 1947. The kilowatt-hour consumption increased by 38 per cent while the revenue per kilowatt-hour sold was down 15 percent.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no report on the activities of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario during 1949 would be complete without an expression of the Government's thanks and appreciation to the Hydro Chairman for his energy and resourcefulness in dealing with the problems arising during the difficult months of the year now past. It is fitting also to refer to the able assistance rendered by the Second Vice-Chairman of the Commission who, because of his many years of Municipal Commission experience coupled with experience gained as President of the Eastern Ontario and the Provincial Municipal Electric Associations, is specially equipped to be of service to the Commission and to the municipalities. To the General Manager and Chief Engineer of the Commission and the two Assistant General Managers, with all the loyal staff of the Commission, who have worked so faithfully, creditably and efficiently the Government and the Commission extend their thanks and appreciation. We are hoping the most difficult days are now over, and while no doubt there will be many problems to face, I believe we can look forward with renewed confidence tothe year that lies ahead.

There has, of course, been some criticism for which the Commission is grateful,- and some of a nature helpful to no one, but fortunately there are those in opposing political groups who have had experience on local Municipal Commissions or on the Provincial Commission itself, and they, having a working knowledge of Hydro problems and Hydro affairs do contribute constructive criticism and suggestions. These are always welcomed by the Provincial Commission. However, where there is lack of knowledge there is always an inadequate understanding and suspicion.

During the past few weeks two interesting incidents referring to past Hydro history have come to my attention. From these we may be able to gather a lesson of importance as far as criticism is concerned; namely, that it is better to be constructive and right than destructive and wrong. The first incident is a letter written by a Statesman a little over forty-seven years ago, by one who later became the co-founder if not the founder of Hydro; and the other is an editorial written some forty-two years ago which, in the light of things as they are to-day, makes the writer look rather ludicrous.

The following is a copy of a letter written by Sir James P. Whitney, K.C., on February 9, 1903. This was three years before the 1906 Act creating The Hydro-Electric Power Commission and would indicate that those who were later to form the government of 1905 were even then eager to advance the power enterprise which was under active consideration.

"

Victoria Building,
Morrisburg, Ontario,
9th February, 1903.

My dear Doctor:

I have your letter of the 5th instant. You have the right end of the power doctrine. I think our position is the correct one and you can rely upon it that we will push it as far as we can.

In Haste,

Yours faithfully,

J.P. Whitney.

Dr. Kaiser,
Oshawa, Ontario."

It is interesting to note that Mr.Whitney, in writing to Dr.Kaiser on September 16th, 1903 - regarding the same power situation in the Province - asked -

> "What would be the attitude of the Township Municipalities - would they consider that too much was being done for the Towns and Villages? Give me your ideas on this point and also as to whether anything could be done for the rural Municipalities."

What would Sir James say could he see the rural Hydro service of today. It is with mixed feelings of pardonable pride and satisfaction that as member for the consistuency which was represented by Prime Minister Sir James Whitney when the Hydro enterprise was created, I have been able in some small measure to help forward the realization of the vision he had over forty-seven years ago, when in connection with the provision of electrical service, he asked "whether anything could be done for the rural municipalities".

The second incident to which I previously referred is an Editorial which appeared in the London Advertiser on June 6, 1908 less than 42 years ago. This Editorial is as follows and speaks for itself:

> "Has the Honourable gentleman become a mono-maniac on the power question? His wild and extravagant assertions have justified the suspicion were it not that they are timed and calculated for election purposes.
>
> "In flight of imagination during his speech the other evening he declared that every cottage, every house, every home in this City will be lighted by electricity. His power scheme would raise men's wages, give two cent fares on the railroads and banish the tenements from Ontario. TheTaxpayer, he went on,

would not pay one cent of the cost which would be borne entirely by the consumers of power.

"His newspaper organ lets its fancy soar even higher and pictures the housewife heating her flat irons by electricity - why not her curling tongs, too?-instead of sweltering before a hot stove on a summer's day. If all the Arabian Nights rhetoric of Mr.Beck and his organ is to be believed, Niagara power is a gift of the fairies to the humblest as free as air, so that by and by the householder will merely have to touch the button and the Beck scheme will do the rest.

"There is little moral difference between the absurd misrepresentations of Mr. Beck and the sort of appeal made by Gamey of Manitoulin, when he tdd the people of Temiskaming that the election of the Government candidate meant a larger expenditure in that riding. There is this difference that Gamey will be able to deliver the goods if the Government is returned to power,while Mr. Beck willnever be able to give effect to the reckless promises which he is dangling before the electors. He is giving the promissory notes which he will never be able to redeem."

From these two episodes of the past may we not indeed learn that it is better in our criticism of the efforts of others to be constructive and right than destructive and wrong.

(BB-1 follows)

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear,

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) give us the source of that editorial?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is the old London Advertiser. It is out of business, but Hydro is still going strong.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): What is the date?

MR. CHALLIES: June 6, 1908.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) since he referred to the frequency conversion program, what does he now estimate will be the cost of frequency conversion? I appreciate the earlier estimates were only estimates, they always are, and they change from year to year. Can he bring us up to date on that? He may have mentioned it, but if he did, I missed it.

MR. CHALLIES: No.

AN hon. MEMBER: The cost per household or municipality?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, it costs money. I am not at the moment asking to whom the money will be charged, I am asking about the cost of the conversion itself.

MR. CHALLIES: I gave the figures on what had happened in 1948. Naturally this is in the organization stage and I was going to say that while we are keeping a close tab on all branches of the cost, whether it is higher or lower than the estimated cost, I am not prepared to say.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, when the project was approved in the first place there was naturally an estimate made of the cost. Now, as you go along from year to year, that estimate surely must be revised. Frankly, I would find

It impossible to believe the Commission would be so negligent in its duties that it would not attempt to revise its estimates of the total cost frmm time to time. That is the figure for which I am asking. That figure surely must be at the command of the hon. minister (Mr. Challies).

MR. CHALLIES: I cannot give it to you.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why not?

MR. FROST: I discussed that point and I was rather interested because I knew they had completed a few townships, and I believe one of the engineers told me their experience was that some of them were a little up and some of them a little bit down,but that the average was remarkably accurate. That is what Mr, Loeming told me. That is only hearsay, of course.

MR. CHALLIES: I might say on the over-all picture it is estimated it was a fifteen-year project, of $200 million. You can appreciate that the inventories, for instance, are running a little higher, of the number of apparatuses in the home that have to be converted. I mentioned that. However, after the visit of the Commission and engineers to the Southern California Electric, who had just emerged from a five-year program of conversion and gave us invaluable assistance, help and everything else, we feel we have saved not only years but millions. It would be folly for me to say how many years or how many millions, but we do feel that by gaining the experience and help we got from the Southern California Electric, we have certainly reduced the time, and the time element itself is money. For me to say what the over-all picture is, is something I cannot do.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the vice-chairman of Hydro to make his statement a little clearer concerning the Niagara development? Naturally I am very vitally in-

terested in that development, especially from a municipal standpoint. From the statements of the chairman of Hydro, for whom I have the utmost respect, we are rather led to believe in Niagara Falls that the development would start almost overnight. I realize, Mr. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) you have to have ratification of the Senate in the United States, and you realize with me the labour problem we will be up against, but even last Monday night, we had the Board of Education before the City Council asking us to build them a new six-room school, and their main argument was because of the fact they would have to supply school rooms for a lot of these children who would be brought in by people working on the development itself.

I would ask the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) to make the statement a little clearer so we will know where we stand in Niagara Falls.

MR. CHALLIES: All I can say is we are very hopeful that the treaty will be ratified very shortly. We are starting on the preliminary plans leading towards that development, so there will be no time lost in that respect. It is estimated it will take probably three years to construct it. When it will start will depend, first, on when the treaty will be ratified, and secondly, in the planning of load by those responsible for that. If we find that we need power by 1953 or 1954 or 1955, as the case may be, then the project will be started to fit in with those years. I cannot give more information than that.

(Take CC follows)

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) has any information in connection with these programs or for the Stewartville Des Joachims, how much horsepower construction costs are over and above what they were in 1947?

MR. CHALLIES: You asked that question before and I think the answer will be forthcoming. What do you want to know? On peak load capacity? Or on what?

MR. DENNISON: On peak load capacity.

MR. CHALLIES: Well, there again, they are capable of 280 thousand horsepower for Des Joachims for a half-hour or fifteen minutes.

MR. DENNISON: We want the average.

MR. CHALLIES: You did not ask for it that way.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? I am sure hon. members of the House are very interested in regard to the frequency change-over and I understand the Comstock people are handling the change-over , at least 10 per cent.

MR. CHALLIES: I think they are running about 10 per cent of the work.

MR. HOUCK: And they have had experience in this work?

MR. CHALLIES: Yes, they were one of three companies and an American one that undertook that work. One of the main reasons, in visiting SouthernCalifornia Electric, I saw the method of handling their conversion, and as I have already said, I was there to get any assistance we could from them. They advised us very strongly to carry on as they carried on, and after the three contracts, of which one was the American Comstock Company, they looked after the deep well conversion, conversion of deep wells in California, which is not a pro-

blem with us, but they looked after the re-winding of certain motors and the meters. The rest was done by contract, and they spoke very highly of the three contractors that were there. Fortunately, the contract people had a Canadian agent and they are one of the largest electrical contractors in the business.

MR. MILLARD: Did the contract company work on a cost-plus basis?

MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. MILLARD: You mentioned labour industries as to increase in the cost of labour. Was that increase in the cost of labour in Hydro itself, the Hydro personally or is that the cost of increase in labour to suppliers to Hydro, and if it is the suppliers, I would like to know whether that includes the profit position that is met or whether it is actual cost in labour increase, that is what I want to know.

MR. CHALLIES: Well, the indices I gave you is construction earnings, that is our own wage earnings on construction. Now, this was taken from the Dominion, not from the industries themselves. Next, is the electrical apparatus industry, that was the labour that went into their equipment.

MR. PARK: Those are the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures you gave us?

MR. CHALLIES: Yes.

MR. PARK: I think you should have given us the indices on profits in order that we would have the whole thing.

MR. FROST: I might point out to the hon. member (Mr. Park) that the purposes of the figures was not to indicate that wages were higher particularly, or that materials were particularly up, but to show you that one horsepower costs a lot more money than it did a few years ago.

MR. PARK: I quite agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) but, I think, to complete the picture there are three things that go into that extra cost and profit is one of them.

MR. FROST: If the hon. member (Mr. Park) will give me the profit, I will tax them for him.

MR. PARK: In 1939, it was 133.4; in 1947 the next figure given by the government it climbed to 408.2. I do not have the 1949 figure but the 1948 figure is 468.2.

MR. CHALLIES: I might point out to the hon. member that we are interested in buying all this equipment at the cheapest possible price and in cases it was purchased from Canadian companies. I want to pay tribute to the Canadian companies. We can buy most of the large plant equipment much cheaper in Canada than even in the United States without the duty. In open competition, the Canadian industries have sent a large horse-power generator to Brazil and that is quite a tribute to Canadian workmen and the Canadian industry. We have just as good an electricl industry as you will find anywhere in the whole world.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: While we are on this, it seems to me to be tremendously important that we get this thing in perspective. I was late for the Session this --

MR. FROST: I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Millard) needs to do that. I do not think that was the implication of what the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) said at all. I think we all realize that you cannot go out today and buy a bag of cement or you cannot get certain work done for the same price that you got it before. I welll remember in this very House here when we used to talk about a capital horsepower

costing around $100. Well, I think today it would cost at least $200.

MR. CHALLIES: Wait till you get into the St. Lawrence.

MR. FROST: Do not mention that. However, that is the story. We are living in a different age and a different time, and by and large, despite all our troubles and the fact that we have different conditions than we had years ago, by and large, it is a pretty satisfactory age to live in. After all, there is no reflection there on anybody or anything.

(CC-5 follows)

M. MILLARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was not suggesting there was any reflection, but I just want to point out that one of the largest suppliers of Hydro equipment, and one of the concerns with the head office in the United States that is primarily concerned with the conversion program, they are paying in wa es for a good deal of the electric l supplies manufactured in Canada, 16 cents an hour less than competing firms in Canada. Now, that is one of the biggest suppliers to Hydro in this company, and I am referring to the General Electric Corporation. It seems to me when e start questioning increased costs for labour on these, we had better be careful that we add the other element that was suggested by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) because there is a corporation that is undoubtedly contributing to the high cost of conversion and to the high cost of construction of the Hydro plants and so, and yet they are paying wages 16 cents an hour less in many cases, than competing firms in Canada.

AN hon. MEMBER: Your salary is all right.

MR. MILLARD: My salary is all right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, that was a very uncalled for remark. I was very interested to hear the hon. minister's (Mr. Challies) reference to purchases in the United Kingdom. I think, as he said, that is largely due to the purchase of the new steam turbine equipment for Toronto and Windsor. I would be interested to hear from the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) w are the prospects of further business with the United Kingdom manufacturing industries? The large order for steam turbine equipment is --

MR. CHALLIES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think you can depend on it, if you can get the equipment and material in Canada, that is where we are buying it. We bought $81 million worth in Ontario, and $5 million odd outside of Ontario. I think that answers the question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It does not. I am inquiring about purchases not in Canada. I am talking about purchases in the United Kingdom.

MR. FROST: We have been interested in that type of thing. We are anxious to purchase everything we can from the old country. We have had representatives here from the United Kingdom government not long ago and we were discussing some of these ideas. I recollect here about two months ago discussing with Hydro the matter of the purchase of certain transformers, very large order in fact, and the question arose as to whether to make the purchases from Canadian manufacturers in Hamilton or to buy them in the United Kingdom. Now, the United Kingdom transformer was an excellent transformer but it really was not built for use such as we require in this country. Now, in the end, I discussed it with the hon. commissioner (Mr. Challies) and we decided to buy the transformers in Canada. Now that is a difficult decision to make. The great majority of these things are not only being made in Canada, but they are being made by our own people here in Ontario. I realize that to get trade overseas we have to do this, we have to be prepared, despite that, to purchase things from our customers overseas. We have to be big enough to do that. We are trying to slant everything we can United Kingdom-wise. We are doing everything we can in that regard, but we must remember this element, they have the things we want to purchase overseas, and we want to purchase from our people overseas, but then the people will turn around.

Now, I discussed the question with the mayor of Hamilton -- I d not mention him particularly -- I discussed the unemployment conditions with him, and with the mayor of Toronto, and you get a great urge to buy at home. The difficulty of finding a balance there is pretty har , but it is

our hope and our desire, and I think these figures indicated that we are purchasing what we can from the old country. The hon. minister (Mr. Challies) along with other hon. members of the Hydro, are going over to the old country shortly to see what can be done in connection with further purchases in the old land. I might assure hon. members of the House that everything we can do we are doing. We would like to ext d that into coal; there is a tremendous market here for coal and the United Kingdom have good coal, and if we can make the necessary arrangements, that would be one of the outs. We will co-operate with the United Kingdom to the fullest possible extent. We have had representatives here on several occasions, we had two or three trade commissioners and representatives, and we are doing everything possible to purchase all we can over there. We do not desire to be bad neighbours with our friends to the south because that is not so, our neighbours to the south are great customers of ours. They come over here, they send tour ts over here, many tourists are bringing in many tens of thousands of dollars' worth of business. I am only following out, apparently, what the American government and the Canadian government have said on cutting down on purchases in the States, and purchase overseas to try and restore the dollar situation, and we are doing our very best in that regard.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all that, but of course the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will also recognize, I think, the good many products which we do not manufacture in this country, and never did, and probably, or, perhaps, never will, over the years. One of the very heavy imports into this country from the United States has been electric machinery -- I am not referring particularly to

the Hydro --

MR. FROST: We are buying most of that in Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, over past years Canada has imported very heavily electric machinery and electric goods from the United States. If the hon. minister (Challies) questions that, I will show him the figures privately, but it is a fact, and keeping that in mind and keeping also in mind what has just been said about the fact that we want to do business with the Americans, I suggest, we have to do more business with the British and I am not too well impressed with the argument we have sometimes heard that British manufacturers are not able to meet the requirements of a climate such as ours. I did travel in Europe and I know a little, not a great deal, but I know a little about the enormous business done in pre-war days in Scandinavian countries and even in Russia, by British manufacturers. To give an exampl , when the city of Moscow built a subway, 18 to 20 years ago, the major electric contracts went to British firms. Now, they wondthis contract in competition, competing with other manufacturers, and they did that job, a major electrical job, in a northern climate which is practically the same as ours. Now, remembering that fact, I am going to be a little disturbed if it turns out -- it is not the Hydro's responsibility -- but I am going to be disturbed if it turns out that the electrical equipment and rolling stock for the Toronto subway is going to come from elsewhere. I suppose we will be given the same line of goods about British manufacturers not being familiar with this climate. Well, having in mind what they did in Moscow so successfully, I am not going to be very much impressed.

MR. CHALLIES: I would like to tell the hon. Leader

of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that he must appreciate the fact that on jobs like that, things do not run any too smoothly, and I would also like to tell him -- it will probably help him -- we are buying what we can in Britain.

MR. DENNISON: Would the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) indicate if he has the figures when the Hydro expects to make this increase in costs of power again? He has suggested in the next few years the will have to be an adjustment, and I presume an adjustment upwards.

MR. CHALLIES: That matter is going on all the time, in the last couple of years it has always been adjusting.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, just to close off that debate, I have rather an interesting thing here, something referring to the London Advertiser, which was absorbed some time ago by the London Free Press, and in today's paper there is this editorial. Strange that it should occur today, when the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) mentioned that other editorial in the Advertiser. It is called "Shining Legacy".

> "About a quarter of a century ago, not long before his death, Sir Adam Beck, the 'Hydro Knight' as we called him, predicted the day would come when London would have an electric street-light on every pole in the city. This week the city fathers authorized the Public Utilities Commission to go ahead with a five-year plan to place a light on every pole. Sometimes in these flush and affluent years, we incline to forget the stringent years of our fathers, and the legacies they left us.
>
> " Sir Adam, far-sighted, energetic, fearless, and at times autocratic, established Hydro in Ontario. Literally, he killed himself in this

tireless endeavour.We owe him a vast debt,and should set him high on the list of those who served the people of Ontario unselfishly, and bequeathed them a valuable heritage."

It is rather remarkable that the editorial from the Advertiser which was telling about Sir Adam Beck's life, was followed by this editorial, 40 years later, by the paper that absorbed the Advertiser.

Vote 21 agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 55, Department of Health.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, that, I take it, completes the agriculture estimates, and I thought the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was going to call the resolution of the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison)?

MR. FROST: Well, I will call that order, too. The only thing is, to call that order I have to bring Mr. Speaker back in the Chair, and report and so on. Perhaps we might go ahead with the Department of Health and Department of Labour, and I will call the hon. member's (Mr. Dennison) order. After the speeches, the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) has 1, he will want some time to absorb the things. In any event, he will want to think them over to get his argument marshalled.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I am sure every hon. member of this House regrets it is not possible for the hon. minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) himself to present the estimates of his Department here tonight. I would like to report to the hon. members of the House that the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) is showing some improvement, and his general health is good,

and as we might expect, his outlook is bright.

Before taking up the estimates of the Department of Health, I should like to give to the hon. members of the House, who I know are very much interested, the latest report on the condition of our popular hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). He is improving steadily but very slowly. His doctor reports that he can move his right leg quite freely now, and his speech has returned to some extent. The hon. minister's (Mr. Kelley) general health is good and, as always, his outlook is bright.

The estimates of the Department of Health for 1950 - 1951 amount of $33,398,950.00, as compared with an amount of $24,099,050.00 for 1949 - 1950, an increase of $9,299,900.00. Last year the departmental appropriations for grants in the Tuberculosis Prevention Branch, approximately $4,000,000.00, and in the Public and Private Hospitals Division, an amount of more than $3,500,000.00, were paid into the Hospitals Aid Fund, and all of the maintenance and capital grants were obtained from that fund. The total expenditure for these two items was well over $13,000,000. This year the Department of Health estimates provide for these payments and are, therefore, increased by approximately $5 million, for Public and Private Hospitals, and by more than $1,500,000. for grants to Sanatoria.

The balance of our increase this year is due primarily to the additional money required for the Hospitals Division. Through the co-operation of the Department of Public Works, it will be possible to progressively overcome our pressing need for hospital bed accommodation for the mentally ill and mental defectives over the next few years. We are pleased that the Department of Public Works has now made available to the Department of Health the premises acquired at Aurora. As of today, 164 defective, male patients have been transferred

from the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia, and by April 6th the full complement of 250 patients will have been transferred to this hospital. It is hoped that accommodation will be available for other mentally defective patients in Smith's Falls before the end of this summer. This year the hospital at Smiths Falls will quite probably admit 450 patients and, when it is completed, accommodation will be available for 1800 patients. The Votes for these two hospitals amount to more than $500,000.

As announced by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr Doucett) the Rowe property in Cobourg, formerly used by the Department of Reform Institutions, has been transferred to the Department of Health, and, just as soon as the building has been renovated, accommodation will be available there for 60 elderly, female patients. In addition to this, the Ontario Hospital at St. Thomas will be operating at capacity this year, which will mean that 1,800 beds, rather than the 1,768 now being used, will be available at that hospital.

All of these advances will assist in removing the seriously overcrowded conditions in the Ontario Hospitals today. When the new hospital at Smith's Falls is completed there should then be adequate accommodation to meet the province's requirements for mentally defective persons, and with what is already under way, the recently announced program, beginning with the hospital at Port Arthur, should enable us within the next five years to meet our obligation to provide care for the mentally ill.

By a planned program for increased assistance to hospitals and sanatoria the facilities available have been greatly expanded. There are now under construction in Ontario 3,225 beds for active treatment hospitals, and 590 beds for chronic patients, and the sanatoria are planning a 1950

building program which will extend the facilities available for the care of those suffering from tuberculosis. We have been materially assisted in providing hospital beds of all kinds by being able to co-operate with the federal government on construction grants for this purpose. The grants are paid by each government on the basis of $1,000 per bed for active treatment hospitals; and the provincial government pays $2,000 per bed for chronic hospitals and $2,500 per bed for sanatoria, and in these two cases the federal government contributes $1,500 per bed.

In 1946, due to the shortage of nursing personnel, the training of nursing assistants was undertaken. The costs of this were borne jointly by the departments of Health and Eduction until this year. Beginning in 1950-1951, the department of Health will pay for training in the centres established prior to 1949, namely Toronto and Kingston, and the federal grant scheme for professional training will take care of the costs in any new centre. To date the only new centre to be established is one at Fort William. More than 450 nursing assistants have already completed these courses and are doing excellent work in the hospitals of the province. An additional 218 are still in training and new courses will commence in April.

All of the divisions of the Department of Health have increased their services to the public during the past year. This is particularly true of the central laboratory where the services provided have grown so rapidly during recent years that new premises have had to be obtained. The laboratory will soon all be housed in one of the buildings formerly belonging to Christie St. Hospital. The provincial laboratory, in 1949, performed more than 1,500,000 examinations. With

new and adequate quarters we will be able to employ much needed staff and continue to expand this remarkably fine service to the hospitals, municipalities and individuals of this province.

The record of the department in many fields, which cannot all be covered in this brief introduction, is good, and the services required in Ontario are being provided to the best of our ability. The increased spending for this Department does not in any way balance the increased services which are being provided continually.

To accomplish what must be done in the Department of Health, a re-allocation of duties for the senior staff in the Department of Health has been planned, and is now under way. Due to the increased amount of work in the field of business administration, it is thought desirable that there should be a clear-cut division of staff responsibility, and in future all matters directly connected with this branch of our activities will be set up under a comptroller. He will have jurisdiction over personnel and all financial and business problems of the department. This will make the highly technical services of the professional staff more readily available to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley), and to the public, and will relieve these officials of a large amount of detail to which they have been devoting too much time in the past. It is also thought advisable to carry out the re-organization in such a way that there will be a clear-cut division between the hospitals branch (including mental hospitals, sanatoria and public hospitals) and public health administration, which is mainly concerned with preventive medicine. More efficient operation within the department should result from this, and our very large expenditures will thereby be carefully supervised and wisely distributed in the public interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all very glad to hear that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) is improving and yet I feel he has a very capable substitute for his department. At the same time, I want to say I am very disappointed in the plans for the Department of Health. Throughout the English-speaking world, we have witnessed during the past few years hospitalization plans in Britain, medical plans in Britain, that embraced the entire population through public taxation. We have the same scheme, in effect, in Australia. We have a public health hospitalization scheme in New Zealand, and right here in Canada we have a very,very fine health scheme that has had two years now in operation in the province of British Columbia. We have another scheme of a province with hospitalization plans in Saskatchewan, that has proved very, very successful.

MR. FROST: Does the hon. member (Mr. Temple) know that in these provinces they had to put on a sales tax in order to support that?

MR. TEMPLE: That may be, but I have not heard of the people objecting to that tax and I do not think the people of Ontario would object to a tax for a scheme of this kind.

MR. MILLARD: We have a hospital tax now.

MR. FROST: But not very much.

MR. TEMPLE: Even in the United States, they are proposing to bring down a public scheme of hospitalization and medical care which I think is going to be one of the most progressive things we have seen in North America. I have a clipping here which I would like to read. It was an interview given in London by Oscar Ewing, President Truman's welfare chief, and he said from what he had seen of Britain's

Health program, the national health insurance proposal will be good for America.

He said the proposed American plan would include wigs, spectacles and false teeth, because the cost of these articles under the British plan was not excessive.

However, the American plan would not supply free medical attention to foreigners as did the British. "They will not be insured under the program, and therefore will pay for what they get" he said.

Mr. Ewing estimated that the cost of the proposed American program at $4,500,000,000. a year was to be raised through pay-roll deductions of 3 per cent, shared equally between employers and employees. As soon as more dentists were available to provide full dental care, the pay-roll deductions would be increased to 4 per cent, he added.

The British health scheme is paid for out of taxes.

Now, in the province of Ontario, it seems to me that we are using the most expensive method of paying for the health of the people. We have overlapping and waste and duplication; we have a multiplicity of high-pressure selling schemes with advertising and their selling costs that are taking the payments out of the people without giving them back their dollar's worth of value. I have a quotation here along that line that is rather illuminating. It says that the research division of the American Medical Association figure that the employer costs of the British health scheme were $23 per capita. That is for last year, while similar costs for medicine in the United States amounted to $63per capita. The people of the United States are paying $63 for the health that they receive under the present methods and a large percentage of the people that need medical care

are unable to get it because they cannot pay for it, and yet it costs three times as much as it does in Britain where every person is covered. I think if we wanted to adopt a province-wide hospitalization plan as a starter, we would have the co-operation of everyone in the province, and I think it would be accomplished at a lot lower cost to the people in the province. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would mind indicating if the Cabinet has considered a plan such as this. Surely they have discussed it and considered it. Perhaps he might give us an outline of what he thinks of such a plan?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think as acting minister, I will wait till after the Session before giving consideration to the plan the hon. member (Mr. Temple) has mentioned.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, while the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) is giving the matter consideration, I would like to say a few words on the estimates. I am going to reserve the greater part of what I expected to say, had intended to say, on the Department of Health, until I speak on the Budget, because it is getting late.

(Take DD follows)

I want to begin by joining with those who have expressed regret owing to the fact that the hon. minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) is not able to be with us at this Session, and to say how gratified I am to learn that he is making progress, and he is cheerful at heart. I have on more than one occasion expressed warm admi for the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) because I think he has acted as a Minister of Health should act. When he lieved in a health reform he has not hesitated to take that reform out to the people and win public support for it, and I eel that two very important steps, which were taken in the past year since we last met here, can be credited in large measure to the fine public campaigning which the hon. Minister of Health (Mrl Kelley) did throughout this province. I am referring to the decision to include nurses and hospital personnel under the benefits of the Compensation Act, and, secondly, the extension of the X-ray system into the hospitals of Ontario. We now f nd that there are only about 32 hospitals in the whole province which are not equipped with these machines, and I am informed by an official of the department that it is hoped than an increasing number can be brought into the scheme within a short time.

Now, I think that the importance of the action taken by the department is shown by an answer to a question of mine on the Order Paper, as it appears on page 212 of Votes and Proceedings. It shows that since the scheme has been operating, approximately 1200 cases have been diagnosed provisionally, and that 156 have been found active; another 271 undetermined, and 701 probably inactive. That will give the hon. members of this House an indication of what has been happening during the year, in regard to patients entering

our hospitals during the years. With patients entering our hospitals without being X-rayed, perhaps thousands of people going into these hospitals spread that disease amongst the nurses and hospital personnel and make it necessary for the province of Ontario to spend millions of dollars to cure these people. We are told it cost about $2800. to cure a case of tuberculosis.

I think this is a big step forward, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) and the department are to be complimented for pressing that needed reform, and I hope before we meet again next year, all the hospitals will be participating, and that the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) will present to this House an amendment to the Public Service Act, which will make it compulsory for any hospital to X-ray all patients on admission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions I want to putto the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow). I will mention them now, and while he is getting the answer, I will say just a few more words.

First of all, I would like to know if the division of psychiatric research is functioning as a part of the department, and if so, who is in charge of that work. I believe it was established in 1944.

Secondly, I would like to know how many of the 53 psychiatrists who were on loan to the armed forces during the war, are now back on duty in the department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the House must have been struck by the fact that the introductory remarks of the acting Minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) dealt very largely with the problem of mental health in the province. And while I think we can welcome the five-year plan which has been

announced, which will increase the accommodations for mentally ill people in this province, nevertheless, I think we have to bear in mind that we are still lagging far behind the requirements of the situation. I would remind the House that in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the 1944 Session it was pointed out to us that at that time there were 14,172 patients then occupying accommodations originally planned for 11,000 persons. Up to now, the number of beds added has been infinitesimal. It is true there are plans for the future, but actually, since 1944, we have not increased the bed accommodation much.

MR. FROST: Oh yes, the St. Thomas hospital.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, but it does not begin to meet the requirements.

MR. GOODFELLOW: We had an addition at Orillia also.

MR. MacLEOD: Let me finish the point. The Speech from the Throne in 1944 told us that in 1944, to meet the requirement os the situation as it stood then, we needed, in the province of Ontario 19,000 beds. Those were needed then. I am quoting now from the Speech read by his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, when the House opened in 1944.

In 1950, we have approximately 18,000 patients in the province of Ontario, and they are occupying --

MR. W. B. HARVEY (Nipissing): You are making a good speech.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to say a word for the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey). This hon. member (Mr. Harvey, Nipissing) has been in the House now for several years, and I have never heard him open his mouth except to make some rude remark.

MR. HARVEY (Nipissing): I hope you enjoy it.

MR. MacLEOD: -- when he is speaking. I am taking

my membership in this House very seriously, and if you want to act like a nut --

THE CHAIRMAN: Order. Kindly withdraw that remark.

MR. MILLARD: Which remark?

MR. MacLEOD: I suggest you should call this hon. member (Mr. Harvey) to order, Mr. Chairman. He has been making nasty remarks about people on this side of the House all evening.

MR. MILLARD: The deputy chairman of the Liquor Commission should take hold of him.

MR. MacLEOD: I suggest the hon. member (Mr. Foote) who sits alongside of him, should take him in hand, and cut down the consumption a bit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not like that sort of thing. I never interrupt the hon. members of this House.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, do you not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

I suggest to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that he withdraw that remark.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, if you are --

THE CHAIRMAN: To the effect that the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) is a "nut".

MR. MacLEOD: I suggest any hon. member who, without any provocation whatever, breaks into a statement somebody is trying to make in all seriousness, there must be something the matter. Is that parliamentary?

I was dealing with the fact that in 1944 we had, according to the Speech from the Throne, hospital accommodations capable of providing for 11,000 patients. We then had in excess of 14,000 in these institutions, and the Speech from

the Throne pointed out that in 1944, we needed 19,000 beds to take care of the 14,000 patients.

Well, this is 1950, and we have 18,000 people in these hospitals. As the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should know, and as the hon. acting minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) pointed out, some additional accommodation has been provided, but we are still far behind our actual needs.

In addition to that, several thousand of those patients are now detained in institutions which cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be called mental hospitals at all.

I have said many times in this House -- and I repeat again -- that the institution at 999 Queen St. is not a mental hospital; it is a place of detention, and is not equipped in any way to give the people who are incarcerated there the treatment that mental patients should have.

I would have thought that included in the five-year plan would have been the promise to close 999 down entirely, as P.D. Ross recommended 20 years ago. It was so obsolete 20 years ago, that he simply took it for granted that by the time his report was filed, the place would close up. But there it still stands, as a monument to the very cold-blooded, callous attitude toward people for whom we ought to have consideration.

MR. DUNBAR: You are not looking for sympathy, are you?

MR. MacLEOD: What is the point?

MR. DUNBAR: Are you looking for sympathy for yourself?

MR. MacLEOD: What is the point?

MR. DUNBAR: They might offer you a little sympathy.

MR. MacLEOD: I am not asking for sympathy.

MR. DUNBAR: I did not think so.

MR. MacLEOD: Of course, if anybody offers sympathy, I am always glad to have it.

MR. MILLARD: I am just pressing a grievance, but the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) would not understand.

MR. MacLEOD: I am sorry --

MR. DUNBAR: We will offer you sympathy inside the House, but not outside.

MR. MacLEOD: I could finish quite quickly if I were not interrupted. I am trying to state a case.

The Speech from the Throne, in 1945, taking cognizance of a very serious situation, said that owing to the extent of this particular problem at that time, the government had decided on two other approaches which should be made to the problem, namely, research and prevention.

I am reading now from the Speech from the Throne. It goes on to say:

> "With this in mind, a division of psychiatric research has been organized, with a well-known British physician in charge".

I have tried to keep in touch with the Department of Health, but I have never been able to run into that gentleman. If he was ever appointed, I do not know who he is. I do not see how he could have been taken care of if he was appointed, because the estimates we have dealt with since 1944 show that the annual appropriation for psychiatric research has run anywhere from $2500. to $3000. During the last years, I think we have spent something like $30,000., that is, we have made an appropriation for psychiatric research to the extent of $30,000., but I dot think that amount was actually spent. So if this distinguished British physician, who was put in charge of this work, has had to

carry on with the amount of money we have appropriated for this purpose, he must be in a very bad condition indeed.

Then it says that in the field of progress, it is proposed to extend the municipal health clinics to serve all parts of the province, as soon as the 57 physicians now on loan for special work in the armed forces, can become available. The hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) will know there is a connection between what I have read, and the question I placed before him.

Finally, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we might just as well face up to the fact, that if the existing so-called mental institutions in the province of Ontario were properly staffed, and adequately staffed, in line with the staffing of the modern up-to-date institutions now functioning in the United States, the province of Ontario in 1950 would be spending almost the total appropriation of the Department of Health on the maintenance of mental hospitals.

Figures have been given to show the inadequate state of staffing in these hospitals. One doctor for each 293 patients; 1 psychiatrist for each 1888 patients; one occupational therapist for 585 patients; one social worker for each 1700 patients; and one trained nurse for each 56 patients. When you relate those figures to the staff provisions of modern mental institutions, such as the Winter Hospital in Kansas, it will be readily seen, if we were really doing our duty by the mental hospitals in Ontario, we would be spending for those hospitals alone what we are now spending for all health purposes in the province of Ontario.

Last year I made the observation that almost one-half of the total health appropriation was for the up-keep of

these institutions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter, and I think that in planning to cope with the problem we have got to go beyond the mere providing of beds in hospitals. I think we will have to get back to the approach which was outlined in the Speech from the Throne, in 1944, and pay more attention to research, and, above all, to prevention. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) observed in his contribution to the Throne debate, there is a connection between the increase in mental illness and the conditions under which people are living in this province. No doubt about that. Dr. Hincks, who I think is a very reputable man, told us that about 40 per cent of the Canadian people are suffering from mental illness. I do not feel that the government is indifferent to this problem. I think the government could be persuaded to take some action in line with what was contemplated seven years ago, but up to now, very little has been done.

I would ask the hon. acting minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) to give some thought to the fact that in the last seven or eight years we have spent something between $ 70 million and $80 million on the maintenance of these places of detention, and have only provided $30,000. in an attempt to get at the reasons why so many people are being committed to institutions of that type. It has doubled in the last 20 years. When P.E. Ross made his investigation, there was approximately 10,000 mental patients in the province of Ontario. Today there are 20,000 we know of, and probably thousands of others who should be receiving special treatment. That is rather more than I had intended to say, but I would like to get answers to my two questions; is there any

division of psychiatric research; who is the British research physician in charge, and did the 57 psychiatrists who were loaned by the department to the army return to duty at the close of the war?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question asked by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) I have no knowledge that there is a director of psychiatric research. I presume if he was destined to come here, something must have happened to the propeller or the rudder, because he did not arrive, apparently.

MR. MacLEOD: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) mind if I just remind him that what I read from the Speech from the Throne says:

> " A division of psychiatric research has been organized with a well-known British research physician in charge".

That is the Speech from the Throne in 1944 that it "had been organized".

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think the intentions were good, but it was difficult to get psychiatrists. That is the difficulty the Department of Health is faced with at the present time.

Out of the 57 who enlisted, only 20 returned to the service, and very few are taking a post-graduate course in psychiatry at the present time. We are hoping an improvement will be made in the near future, and we are making every effort possible to secure more psychiatric services.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) could tell us if he has been able to secure any psychiatrists from our universities? Has he tried the departments there for help to

take care of the patients in these institutions?

Together with other hon. members of this House, I visited the mental institution on Queen St. and the one in New Toronto, and what impressed me was the number of people who are in reality old-age pensioners, but have mentally deteriorated, and being in these institutions, seem to be beyond all hope of cure, and they are, it seems to me, waiting for death, and they should not properly be in a mental hospital at all. I think these people are classed as "seniles", and in British Columbia they segregate them. They have built in that province seven buildings capable of accommodating 200 patients each, and these seniles are kept apart in those seven hospitals, and receive proper care.

It does not seem to me there is much in the building program the government has announced for our mentally ill people, and I do not think they should be concentrated in large buildings, when the government might better spend the money in smaller regional hospitals, because these large buildings do seem to me to be more like jails than places of cure.

People are sent there, and are locked up, and the emphasis has not been upon cure, but it is upon detention.

I would like to urge the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to take that into consideration, because from the best authority I have read, it was stated that people are cured by human contacts, and not by bricks and mortar. When you lock people up in these big buildings, such as the hon. minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is building in his constituency, which I think will hold 2,000 or more mental patients when it is finally completed, it does seem to me there is danger that they are just sent there much like

being sent to jail. And the emphasis is not on cure, but on detention.

I have a few other things which I want to say perhaps as we go along, but I will wait until we come to the detailed estimates.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote, regarding the consideration of the estimates, I want to say a few words of a general character as well. I want to say that it is very difficult to discuss the problem in the absence of the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) whose return to his duties we are all looking forward to. But it is not the problem of one hon. minister. It is a problem which, I think, concerns the entire government, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) must face upt to this problem as much as anyone of the Cabinet members present; certainly far more than the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) who is pinch-hitting for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) tonight.

It is true there have been increases in the expenditures in the health estimates for the last few years. But it is also true that our population increased, and it is also true that the government has placed a new tax on the people to provide for additional health services, so in acknowledging additional expenditures, it is, nevertheless, necessary, in my opinion -- vitally necessary -- for the Opposition to shock the government into a realization that they have not lived up to the responsibilities which faced them.

Furthermore, they have not lived up to their promises given to the people of this province, in regard to health protection. It would be of very little use to the people, for them to stand up -- I mean the Opposition in its entirety --

and throw flowers here. The hon. members are ready to catch those things, I know. But occasions for throwing such things are few and far between, and it is our job to hit at you, because you have not lived up to your promises. Governments do not like to be reminded of that, and the government often says the twenty-two points have been carried out; they have been completed, and now they are at point sixty-six and two thirds, somewhere away up in the north, where we just cannot see them.

Let me embarrass the government -- and I am deliberately trying to embarrass them on this question, and I hope I succeed, because of the urgency -- by reminding them of point number eleven of the twenty-two points:

> "Steps will be taken to insure that every child is given the reatest possible opportunity to face life with a healthy body and mind; health measures will be established, so that medical, dental, and other health protection will be available to all."

Do you "get"that -- "to all"? That was point number eleven.

Now, r in mind the point raised by the hon. member for High ark (Mr. Temple) and the indicting speech made by my colleague, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod).

(Take EE follows)

You see, you have failed completely to carry out a major point of that programme that you presented to the people. Now, lest you think that was a very general promise, I will read to you another statement to embarrass the government, and I hope they will be. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I think is a sensitive person, and I am deliberately trying to egg him on.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: So that he acts, and acts more speedily than in the past. In 1923, the then Hon. Minister of Health, who had the decency to run away when he saw he could not carry through the promise, the then hon. Minister of Health, Dr. Vivian, made a speech to the Women's Canadian Club in Eaton Auditorium, he gave flesh and blood, you notice, to point eleven; he said:

> "We must remove financial fear, both to encourage sick people to apply for treatment and to see that their speedy recovery is not hindered by worry over those who are dependent on them."

In other words, not only should the sick have the facilities required for getting well, but their families should not be burdened with worries which in turn will worry the sick person. And yet a month ago, I was appealed to by a family whose bread-winner is in the hospital, a tubercular hospital, for assistance in their effort to get the mother's allowance. I want to say they were given the mother's allowance after they were refused, but there was a family worried, upset, unable to make ends meet. The head of the family was in hospital and another member of the family also suffering from a minor case of tuberculosis and confined to the home, and they came to an hon. member of the House for assistance

in order to get mother's allowance, yet that was the promise made in 1943, in giving flesh and blood to point number eleven.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) give me the name of the applicant for mother's allowance, so I can check with the Department and find why it was not granted, because it is the policy of the Mother's Allowance Commission to grant mother's allowance without question when the husband or father is necessarily taken into a sanitorium.

MR. SALSBERG: I ill gladly do that, and I would inform the the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) that his department acted quite speedily when I brought it to their attention, and the family is receiving the mother's allowance.

Dr. Vivian then goes on to say:

> "Later we will see there is provision of such diagnostic measures as are necessary and that these will be made available to everyone at a cost within their ability to pay."

That was promised seven years ago. Further, he says;

> "Provisions will have to be made for the best surgical care in Ontario for everyone, without financial fear".

Now that was the way Dr. Vivian hoped to implement point eleven of the 22 points. And we are meeting seven years later, and my colleague (Mr. MacLeod) is performing a service to the province in dramatically presenting our problem of the mentally ill, and the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) has raised the whole question of hospitalization, or the health scheme. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, and I direct it especially to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in view of

the absence of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) that the reason we have not enough psychiatrists and psychiatric hospitals diagnostic institutions for the mentally ill, is because you are not giving your department enough money. That is all. I think you have an excellent staff of top officials, I am sure they are aware of the short-comings. Provide them with funds, and you will find that specialists will accept positions, will come here, and though I do not care to have these things broadcast, I think it would be safe to say within the confines of this House that Ontario is extremely backward --

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: -- in the psychiatric field altogether. It is uptto the government to provide the funds that will attract young physicians to specialize, to give them the money for the period that is required for specialization. It is a wrong. And it requires a lot of funds.

Many of those who studied and prepared themselves left for the United States. I think the Department heads will provide the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the acting Minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) with a long list of promising young psychiatrists who have left the country because they have greater opportunities in the United States.

Now then, you will say: "Well, there's the Opposition talking, it is their job and they enjoy it".

Let me then draw your attention to a few editorials in the Toronto Telegram, a Tory paper, if ever there was one, yet the Telegram of February 27th, speaking of the deficits that the city is confronted with because of the failure of the province to care for the indigent patients, says the

following:

> "It was city council's understanding that any future deficits would be met out of the hospital aid fund".

And that is true. I agree with this interpretation. That was the general feeling in Toronto and elsewhere, that when the hospital tax was put on, then the hospital deficit would be taken care of.

Then the Telegram follows that up, and I like the way they follow it up.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That was never said about that at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) knows that.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I think on a previous occasion I said that was the impression left with the people.

MR. FROST: I do not care what the impression was, it is what I said. You can read it for yourself. I said no such thing.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, you will please send a letter to the editor of the Telegram.

MR. FROST: I will let you do that.

MR. SALSBERG: And he will perhaps correct it. But I think the Telegram presents an interpreation which is generally correct. That was the impression left with the people.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) sits in this House very diligently and hears what goes on, and he knows that is completely aside from what was said. He knows that. Why does not my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) try to give the correct impression, instead of trying to read a lot of funny things into the subject? There have been very clear statements made about that, there is no need for re-hashing it,

my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) knows all about it, he destroys his effectiveness by going out on tangents of that sort and departing from the facts.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I resent those implications.

MR. FROST: Well, I like to keep you on the track, anyway.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows I am not reading "funny stuff". I have my opinion of Telegram editorials and I will not call them "funny business". I will call them "reactionary business," at times, "backward business," but I will not call them "funny business." They are not comic strips. The reason I refer to these editorials is because I want to strengthen my case and to impress you more than perhaps I alone could, by pointing to the Toronto Telegram, which is a paper supporting you, to prove the point.

MR. FROST: I can send over to my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) the copy of the Budget speech of 1947 and of 1948, which states in black and white what was said. My hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) does not need to read the Telegram, nor from a brief or anything. It is right in black and white for him to read.

MR. SALSBERG: Let me say I am not here defending the Telegram, the Lord knows I have never defended that paper on any occasion, I am merely quoting from it since it is a Conservative paper of long-standing -- well, it is a Tory paper, it is the Toriest of all papers as far as I am aware, and if I cannot quote from a Tory newspaper editorial page, then I do not know what the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) will want me to quote. Would you prefer the Canadian Tribune? I can quote from that.

MR. FROST: I can only say my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg)

is having a very amusing time in stating a lot of things that have no connection with facts at all. I would point out to him that we have been getting along very well today and it is ten minutes after ten and we have a lot of ground to cover. I know we all enjoy listening to his speeches when we have time, but when we get pressed and are down to business, for goodness sakes stick to facts.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, there is a sign I have been somewhat successful in my efforts tonight. The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) has become a bit disturbed.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: And he appeals to me to stop quoting from the Telegram. That is a good sign. I am very glad there are some indications of the fact that it has hit home and it hurts a little.

MR. GOODFELLOW: It might be a sign we need a consulting psychiatrist.

MR. SALSBERG: I beg your pardon?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Maybe we should consult a psychiatrist.

MR. SALSBERG: If you think that is what your leader requires, that is up to you. I am not suggesting it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: As hon. minister of Welfare, you ought to be the one in the Cabinet to decide what is affecting him and all others in the Cabinet. The Telegram follows this up and says:

> "A Toronto M.P.P. could be justified in reminding the government that in 1948 -- "

The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), I see, is going out, --

> " -- it established the Hospital Aid Fund and that the Provincial Treasurer estimated it would receive in the fiscal year 1949 - 50 the sum of

six and a half million dollars from the 20 per cent amusement tax specially levied for that purpose. It would be pertinent to ask how much exactly was collected for the funds, how much of this sum from Toronto and how much was contributed to Toronto."

I put that question on the Order Paper, and I must say a few weeks have gone by, those figures are readily available, I am sure, in the Treasury Department, and no answer has been given to that question yet. Why? Because the answer would show the government has not met its obligation in that field in caring for the sick and in helping to cover deficits in different municipalities.

I am sorry the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has left his chair. I hoped that he would be affected a little differently, that he would get up instead and say that in view of the promise made in the 22 point program, in view of the pledges made by a former hon. Minister of Health (Dr. Vivian), in view of the pressure brought on him not only by the Opposition but by a Conservative newspaper such as the Toronto Telegram, that the government will really begin to meet the problem, will live up to its promises and will provide conditions that until now have not been provided, despite the increases in the Health estimates.

Well, the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is gone, but I do hope, --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Is he back? Oh, he will be back, I am sure. I should be sorry not to see him back this evening. However, I do hope the government will take into account these few general remarks made by hon. members of the Opposition before we get down to considering special items in the Budget.

It concerns the health, both mental and physical, of the people of this province, and I do not think any hon. member so far has wasted the time of the House when bringing such important matters to its attention at the one time of theyear when the esimates on Health are before the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L.F.K. FELL (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I was going to wait to see if the question I had in mind would come up under these votes, but I have checked through them and I do not find anything shown on the question.

It is a question I raised last year when I spoke at some length on the question of mental hospitals, and is entirely in line with some remarks which have already been made. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), for instance, has pointed it out, I do not think it was entirely necessary, I think every hon. member of the House who has looked very closely at the mental situation in this province realizes that there is a very definite shortage of doctors and nurses and specialists.

In addition to this.problem, I pointed out that there was an extreme shortage of hospital attendants. I pointed out at that time, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) that the role the hospital attendants play in the treatment of mentally ill persons is very important. Perhaps 60 to 75 per cent of the actual care given to the patients is given by hospital attendants. I outlined at that time a visit I had to made to the hospital at 999 Queen West, and referred to the situation which I saw whereby literally many dozens of patients were roaming aimlessly up and down the halls. I enquired what kind of treatment they were undergoing at the time and was informed they were not receiving treatment,

they were merely receiving exercise.

In speaking to the attendants in charge, I discovered they were over-worked. I do not think this is a contentious point, I think we all agree they are overworked. The question was asked: "Why have we not got more attendants?" and, incidentally,"Why have we not got better-qualified attendants?" I pointed out, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) at that time that there were two particularly important reasons. The first was that we were not making this type of work attractive enough to draw the right kind of people for that type of work, in other words, the wages were low, they were not completely satisfactory. That is the type of work which very few people would like to do, and unless the wages are satisfactory, it naturally follows you just do not get the kind of people you require.

In addition to this, as was pointed out, there is no particular set-up for training people for this type of thing. With nurses, we find there are excellent training schools in which a girl who wishes to become a nurse must undergo some preliminary training, enter a hospital and do practical work and study as well for a period of years before she is allowed to go out and receive, or at least accept, tremendous responsibilities as a qualified nurse.

In the case of our mental hospitals, we do some screening, we try to get the best possible people out of those who do apply. However, to get the best of the kind of people who do apply is not a very high standard of help. I do still think, as I said last year, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) that the responsibilities and the strains and the stress that are now being placed upon our doctors and nurses who are working in these hospitals could be tremendously reduced

and they could receive tremendous assistance if we could provide them with adequate competent hospital attendants.

I think it is very important, I think they should have some basic training in attitudes towards patients. It is a very trying thing. I think any married man realizes quite often, if they have children, you have to use a bit of psychology, they get on your nerves, do they not? In these hospitals, I think these attendants must find their patients trying, and unless they have had some kind of training in the project, they may not take to these people under certain circumstances. It must naturally follow they lose their patience as well, and cannot provide adequate service. I think we need more of this type of assistance.

There must be some reason we cannot get doctors, more trained nurses and specialists in Ontario for these jobs. I suspect it is because, again, the job is not being made attractive enough to interest the right kind of doctors and nurses, etc. Perhaps it is the old story of "we can make more money below the border", they get their basic training here, then they hop across the line and make their money, or perhaps go to Great Britain and then we have to buy them back, and I suppose it requires large sums of money. I think more training is necessary.

I would like to mention another point: On the question of hospitals, there is a great deal said about the fact that a mentally ill person is not merely a problem to himself, and it is not always merely an economic problem to the persons in his family who are responsible for his care. It goes far beyond that. I had an experience last summer, one which I suspect practically every hon. member of this House has undoubtedly had at one time or another. I had a

man come to see me and ask me if I could assist in getting his mother, a very elderly woman, into a hospital. I asked him the condition of his mother at that time, realizing it was a problem, that our hospitals were full and even if the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) wanted to get a patient in, it was practically impossible. I knew all that, so I did what I suspect most every hon. member would have done, I investigated to find out how seriously ill the mother was, first, and secondly, whatever inconveniences were being caused by this particular lady's condition. I discovered the man himself was on the verge of a nervous breakdown; I discovered his wife had been asked to go away for a rest by the doctor, the family doctor, that her nerves were breaking down. I discovered also they were living in three rooms. Remember, a married man, his wife and two children, and this mentally deficient mother, living in three rooms. They had to give the "old girl" her room and she went through the process, the same process most elderly people do go through when they begin to slip a little, she began to imagine day time was night time and night time was day time and when everyone else wanted to go to bed she was ready to get up and put her shoes on and go shopping. It may seem humorous, but I tell you that old woman could very possibly be the cause of at least two or three other mental conditions in adults in this province, and heaven only knows what those conditions are doing to the children in that family, so there is a possibility of five other people being infected, or affected, by this woman's condition.

What was done? We tried Lambert Lodge, we tried every place we could possibly get. The only places that would take this poor old woman were places the family could not afford to send her. All the hospitals were full. We got the same story everywhere -- and this is true: "Well, of

course this woman is pretty old" -- I think she was close to 70 -- "and you must realize that practically all elderly people when they get to this age pass through this stage, thousands of people have to go through the same problem, and you will have to content yourselves until proper accommodation is available". Mr. Minister, (Mr. Goodfellow) it has been said, and said again, and it is going to be continued to be said until we are doing something adequate to take care of this problem: as far as I am concerned, an ounce of prevention is worth 10 pounds of cure, and the problem today is that our mental patients in these hospitals are getting to a condition where they cannot be cured.

Therefore, in closing my remarks, I would only like to remind the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) again that I am seriously interested, and I believe even the doctors in charge of the hospitals and the attendants themselves are seriously concerned that proper training be provided for these people, adequate wages to attract the right kind of people to do the work in helping our doctors and our nurses who are courageously carrying on this job -- and when I say "courageously" I mean it in every sense of the word. I have seen the conditions under which our doctors are working, and I have seen some of the wonderful results they have obtained and I cannot possibly figure out how it was done. They certainly must have had the Lord on their side. Conditions are typical. I close with that remark, and that request again, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow), that something be done to alleviate this problem.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, last summer the civil servants in all the departments were granted a five-day

week, with the exception of the Department of Health, and the attendants at the mental hospitals were forced to work a five and a half day week during the summer months because of the inability of the Department to secure sufficient help. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) could inform us if the employees and the attendants in the mental hospitals are going to be granted a five-day week this year, along with the other employees?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That would be a matter of government policy, Mr. Chairman. It will have to be decided.

MR. TEMPLE: Well, Mr. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) it was stated last year the government wanted to give them a five-day week, during the summer, but they were short of help. There is plenty of help now available, would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) state that they have sufficient help at the present time, or are they still short-handed?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, we have a direct complement at the present time in the hospitals.

MR. C.CALDER (London): Would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) be good enough to give me the answer to those two questions of which I gave notice? And when I ask for a progress report on the Alcoholics Foundation, I do not just mean that you have got a building, I mean what are you finding out?

Secondly, it was my impression, perhaps an erroneous one that the commissioners under the Cancer Remedy Act, had very largely completed their work at the conclusion of their investigation, and and reported. I am interested to know what the commissioners are doing at this time.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), with respect to the Alcoholic

Research Foundation, I might say that they have made considerable progress inasmuch as they have acquired a hospital which will be used for the treatment of alcoholics. It is hoped that hospital will soon be in operation. We are also giving consideration at the present time to the establishment of a clinic which will serve the purpose more or less of a receiving centre for the screening of patients who might go to this hospital. At the same time, I understand they are considering the employment of a psychiatrist who has had experience in this type of work, who will not only be used at the hospital but also at the clinic to assist these people.

In respect to the second question, it will be necessary for me to consult the officials of the Department to get the reply to that question.

(Take FF follows)

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): I would like to speak on item 55 with respect to indigent patients. This is a problem, and under our present Health Act it is necessary that a municipal hospital take in county patients and a per diem rate is set up, and to show it affects our hospitals, I want to read briefly from the report of Judge Cross of November 2nd, 1949, on the Windsor Metropolitan General Hospital, and I quote:

> "For indigent patients, the hospital now receives from the municipality $2.50 and from the province, $1.76, the basis of which I will explain later, in all, the sum of $4.26 per day. Now the actual cost of such patients is estimated at $11.05. So for every day an indigent is a patient, the hospital loses $6.79."

That is how it affects the hospital in Windsor, and there are other hospitals where they take in county patients, and the county is not prepared to keep the hospital, and hides behind the per diem cost as set up by the Health Act and as a result there is a very heavy deficit that falls on the municipality.

I will read again from the report:

> "The hospital by law is compelled to admit and care for the indigent patients of outside municipalities, and compelled to do so at a loss which the Windsor citizens pay."

And I will read further from the Report:

> "It lay within the power of the Corporation of the county of Essex to correct this injustice by agreement under the Public Hospitals Act, R.S.O. 1937, chap. 390, sec. 17, to pay the additional cost of their indigent patients, or by way of an

annual grant in lieu of such an agreement."

We understand that under the Act it is possible for the county and the municipality to get together, but there is nothing to force the meeting of the per diem cost of hospitalization, and as a consequence, the county is in a position to say, "We are meeting the regulations and we will continue to pay as we are".

I will read again briefly from this report, and I think the hon. members are familiar with this report. I will quote again from the report of Judge Cross.

> "So obvious is the injustice, however, that the only proper remedy is by legislation and failing solution by agreement, legislation should be sought. Legislation could be provided by way of amendment to the Public Hospital Act whereby a municipally-owned hospital shall be permitted to charge its actual cost of care and maintenance of indigent patients from outside municipalities."

And again in the report:

> "I recommend such legislation to the consideration of the Honourable the Minister of Health".

It is essential that the Act be maintained along the lines suggested in the Cross Report, not only for the operating of the hospital at Windsor, but it also affects other municipal hospitals, where they have to take county patients, and insofar as counties are concerned, if they can get cheap hospitalization, they are going to do that. The only way that we can get the counties to "play ball", insofar as the municipalities are concerned, will be to urge the present legislation along the lines of the Cross Report. I would ask the acting Minister of Health (Mr. Goodfellow) whether or not the Department took into consideration the recommenda-

tions in the Cross Report, and what they plan to do about that.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I appreciate the problem with whcih some of the hospitals are confronted with respect to deficits, and particularly those municipalities in which the per diem rate in hospitals for indigents is $2.25 per diem. In the amendment to the Act brought in this afternoon, it is suggested that it will be raised from $2.25 to $3.00 per diem, which will help somewhat the municipalities in which the hospital is located.

MR. ELLIS: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) agree that where the county has patients in the municipal hospitals, that the county should pay the whole cost -- it should not be against some other municipality?

MR. GOODFELLOW: There might be something in that. It gives us some concern in the increased cost of hospitalization, and it is a question whether the hospitals should be granted a blank cheque, and charge full cost back to the municipalities.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): I want to take up one point. I have agreed with what was said previously, and there is no use in going over it again.

One of the things that endeared the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) to the nursing profession of Ontario was his statement that the nurses are treated like coolies. I do not wonder that we are short of nurses. These girls have to endure great hardship, and they give three years of their lives in hard continuous work without compensation for the first two years. I am amazed that we have any girls who are willing to endure that. The hospitals get a lot of free labour, but these girls should be paid. Apprentices in any other line of work are paid something all the way through, while they are learning. In the case of nurses, they work tremendously hard, and in most hospitals they get nothing

until the last year and then very little. I think the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) feels it is a great injustice and I think that is one reason why we are short of nurses. They have to have senior matriculation and then three years of hard work on top of that, long enough to get their B.A., and they are restricted in their activities. They are not treated the same as if they were at a school where they could work and find entertainment in their own time; the nurses are working all the time. Except for the experiment at Windsor, where the nurses'school was run more like a school, nothing has been done to help these nurses in training, and I feel something has to be done. Something has been done, but something more should be done. It is true that in the General Hospital in the private patients' rooms there are now various types of nurses in a different kind of uniform who take care of the cleaning of the room, and so on. That is an improvement and I am glad of it. But we still have not arrived at the stage where we are willing to pay nurses; probably for the first year it would not have to be much, but surely one year of this kind of work, for nothing, is plenty, and in the second and third years I would be inclined to think they should get something. In the second and third years they should be paid, and the hospitals are taking advantage of young women who are fitting themselves for nursing experience, some of them for a life-time of nursing, and all of them for part-time nursing.

I was wondering if anything further has been done with regard to lessening the burden of nurses in Ontario.

MR. GOODFELLOW: As the hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) stated, they have tried out these experiments in Windsor, and I must say that in some of the hospitals the girls get something.

MISS MACPHAIL: In the third year.

MR. GOODFELLOW: In the Ontario Hospitals they get it for the full three years. But about 30 per cent of the nurses get married within one year of their graduation, and it makes a big turn-over, and they do get concrete training that lasts them throughout their life.

Votes 56 to 62 inclusive agreed to.

On vote 63.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): What percentage of the tuberculosis cost is carried by the government?

MR. GOODFELLOW: One hundred per cent.

MR. TEMPLE: That is better than last year. There is an increase in the items on last year, when only 90 per cent were looked after, and I am glad we are taking entire charge this time.

Vote 63 agreed to.

On vote 64.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Coming from Hamilton and the present hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) being a Hamiltonian, it is deeply felt by me that the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley) is not here when we are discussing all these matters on Health. I have the greatest regard for the hon. Minister (Mr. Kelley) and have known him for a number of years, and the other hon. members from Hamilton have expressed deep regret concerning his illness.

I do not know if th e hon. members are aware that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) is almost an institution in himself in Hamilton, and it is unfortunate that we are discussing these conditions while he is on his back in St Joseph's Hospital. For a number of years he was a great sportsman, and while we talk about people after they are gone,

I want to say something about the hon. minister (Mr. Kelley) while he is alive.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWLING: I remember in Hamilton with our lacrosse teams, he would take them all across the country and he would come back with the championship. He has assisted young people in the sports world, and driven them around in his automobile and then has had to work extra hard to keep up with his duties as Minister of Health.

I think it only fair that as a member for Hamilton, and as a person who has known him for 20 years, that I should express my regret that he is still in the hospital, and I hope he will recover and be back at the next Session.

On this vote 64, Industrial Hygiene; we had a peculiar incident happen in the plant in Hamilton, of the International Harvester. A considerable number of the workers developed dermatitis. I notified the Workmen's Compensation Board, and they directed me to the Department of Hygiene and the Department of Health. I wrote to the Department of Healh, and explained to them the conditions that arose in the department of International Harvester Company. In reply, I got a letter which was addressed to myself and the International representative of the Steelworkers' Union, and this letter which came from Dr. Cunningham's office, reads as follows:

(Take GG follows)

MR. J.L. DOWLING: This letter reads:

As you know, Dr. C.H.Wilson from this Division, investigated the skin condition to which you referred in your letter of February 7th.

There were three female employees affected with dermatitis, one of them had been away from work. Dr. Nash had already conducted some tests and made other enquiry as to the cause of the condition. It is considered that the liquid soap which was in use is the main cause of this condition and recommendation has been made to discontinue its use in favour of a bland preparation."

I cannot quite understand why Dr. Wilson, who investigated this condition, and who is perhaps right on his determination as to the cause, reported as he did, because I have here in my hand a copy of the Grievance Report which the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will know is in general use in collective bargaining, in going through a grievance procedure. This says:

"The Union protests the health hazard to employees in these departments, from the components used in bonding the sand.

Several employees have broken out in a rash and lost time due to the use of certain ingredients and many others have suffered from a rash which has not kept them off work but has caused serious discomfort.

The Union asks that the ingredients causing this health hazard be replaced by a mixture not injurious to health."

It is rather surprising, after Dr. Wilson had investigated this condition, that the company themselves, in view of the investigation in their own medical staff, sent a reply to this Grievance Report, reading as follows:

"Grievance re Skin Rash - Core Makers

Referring to the attached grievance regarding a rash which is affecting a number of employees in the Grey Iron and Malleable Core Departments, would advise that, as we believe the Union is aware, the management has been taking steps to endeavour to determine exactly what is causing the trouble complained of but has not been able to satisfy itself on this point as yet. There are apparently a number of confusing aspects to this situation and it has been very difficult thus far to determine which of the several ingredients used in the bonding of the core sand might be responsible for the trouble, or if it might not be something entirely apart from these.

The management is as much concerned about this situation as anyone and believes it is doing everything reasonably possible to find the cause and solution. However, it is apparently going to take some further time to make a definite determination in the matter but we can assure you it is having very serious consideration.

Yours very truly,

H. T. DEAN
Industrial Relations Manager."

It is rather peculiar that here is a company, with their own doctor, who claim they have been investigating this condition, and then did not go to the Union officials in the plant, as appears in the letter dated February 28th, 1950, Dr. Wilson tells them it is not in the sand, it is in the soap they use for washing themselves.

Once again due to the fact that when this Union doctor is making an investigation, he goes to the officers, or to the head of the department concerned, when a condition is reported which is detrimental to the health of the employees, and Dr. Wilson should also have contacted the Union representative in that plant.

I know the Workmen's Compensation Board do follow that policy. Whenever I contact the Workmen's Compensation Board, almost without exception the inspector visits us, and talks with one of us in the plant, and asks for the president or the steward or the representative of the Union, so that we can go down together and see the aggrieved person, interview him, and try to arrive at the cause of the condition which exists. In this case Dr. Wilson did not contact any official.

I suggest to the hon. acting minister (Mr. Goodfellow) that Dr. Cunningham's department be requested that when information such as this is brought to his attention, and an investigation is made in the plant, he always contact the senior officer or one of the officers in the plant, so that an investigation can be made right on the scene, without any

possible reaction thereafter.

Votes 64 to 68 inclusive carried.

On vote 69.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): In regard to item eleven,"provision for payment of grants to public hospitals"; would the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) tell me what the present status is with respect to grants to the hospital in New Liskeard? Perhaps the best way to bring it to his attention is to read from an article in the local paper, of March 22nd, in which appears the following:

"HOSPITAL PLANS DELAYED BY LACK OF FIRM POLICY"

That is the heading from an article in the New Liskeard paper of March 22nd.

I might digress for a moment and say that Mr. Fleming is a former president of the Conservative Association in New Liskeard. The local paper there is a Liberal paper.

This article continues:

"Sod turning for the proposed New Liskeard hospital will be delayed indefinitely, according to Dr. D. R. Fleming, ex-chairman of the board, unless the provincial department of health mends its bumbling, promise-breaking ways and emerges with a clear-cut policy regarding grants for hospitals serving unorganized territories.

Dr. Fleming quotes from a letter received from the Honorable Russell T. Kelley just a year ago in which the Minister of Health said "there is an obligation on behalf of the Government to help hospitals which

serve unorganized territories" and finds cause for alarm in the sharp change of government policy since that time.

"I feel that the main hold-up in the start of this new hospital is due to a lack of a concrete policy on the part of the provincial government" Dr. Fleming said. "Plans for the erection of a hospital here have been formally under way since 1948. The normal provincial and federal grants are available. The town has matched the provincial and federal grants of , $40,000 each through voluntary subscription and will double it before the campaign ends, but the province continues to reduce promised special grants until now we have a figure which is a mere token payment, wholly inadequate for the services we must render."

Dr. Fleming was referring to the fact that originally the provincial minister had indicated that the special grant would be in the neighbourhood of $150,000. On February 2, 1949, this amount was reduced to $122,000 in a letter from Health Minister Kelley. A visit to Queens' Park confirmed this amount, and additional information indicated that the first installment would be forth-coming by March 31, 1949.

Later on in the year the minister advised the board that the deal was off again, but that he was trying to get the federal government to absorb half of the additional grant, and in any event the province would be good for their half.

"The provincial government knows", said Dr. Fleming, "that the federal government has no responsibility for services in unorganized territory, and I was not surprised to hear that they had given a flat 'no' to the proposition."

"The last word on the matter", continued the doctor, "was given to chairman Lorne Woods about three weeks ago. At that time he was advised that the provincial government would make a special grant between thirty and forty thousand dollars and was assured that the amount would be forwarded to the board within a week. Up to now it has not been received."

This was on March 22nd, so, Mr. hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) we have grants dropping down from $150,000 to $40,000 in the space of one year, and apparently no settlement yet.

Has that matter been disposed of, or what is the actual situation?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I might say to the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) in respect to the New Liskeard hospital, I am only partly conversant with it. It is one of those areas where the outside municipalities have a very small assessment, and it is not possible for them to make any great contribution. New Liskeard itself is rather a small town, that is, to support a new hospital. On the other hand, a regular grant was available to New Liskeard amounting to $1,000 per bed, which would be supplemented by a federal grant of $1,000 per bed, and in connec-

tion with this hospital, we felt we should work out some formula. If a deputation came in from New Liskeard, the minister just cannot say "you should get $125,000", and if a deputation came in from Espanola, to have him say "you should have $175,000". That could not be done, so we thought there should be a formula, and we worked out a formula, taking into consideration the unorganized area surrounding New Liskeard, based on the number of patient days from the outside unorganized municipalities, in proportion to the number of days from the organized area. I just forget the figure, but I think the figure the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) mentioned is correct, it is either $30,000 or $40,000, that is the figure we worked out in the formula.

Mr. TAYLOR: How do we reconcile that with the original payment of $150,000?

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): On vote 69, Mr. Chairman, No. 11; we find a very large figure for the payment of grants to public hospitals, with authority under the Act of the legislature, and regulations made thereunder, amounting to $8,350,000. That is rather a large blank cheque. Could we have some explanation of that.

MR. GOODFELLOW: That amount is made up of grants which were in this item last year, and also the transfer from the hospital aid funds. That has now been transferred over into the public hospital branch. Last year there was about $5,000,000 paid in maintenance grants to hospitals, out of the hospital aid fund. This year it will all be paid out of these items.

MR. WISMER: Will the $5,000,000 be about the same?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Our expenditure will be greater this year, because of the increase in the number of beds across the province.

MR. WISMER: Will this be all the maintenance?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Yes.

MR. WISMER: No construction grants?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where do these construction grants appear?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I am sorry. The construction costs are in that item.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just a minute, before we leave that item. Last year there were capital expenditures in this department of $13,775,000. This year there is nothing set up under the heading of "capital expenditures". What is the reason for that? Is it a change in practice, or a change in policy?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, I have not the figures here for 1949, but in 1948 we paid $12,187,018 in grants to hospitals on the basis of $1,000 per bed, and in the same year we are adding $4,675,000 of maintenance grants, making a total just under $7,000,000 for capital and maintenance.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The point I am getting at is this; there must be a reason for it. Last year-- and I am referring now to last year's estimate-- there was so much carried in the hospital aid fund. Is that the reason? Last year you charged $13,775,000 under the heading of "payments". This year there

is nothing whatsoever under the heading of "capital payments" for the department of health.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I am sorry I have not a copy of last year's estimates here. By this estimate this year, we will spend $6,100,000 on maintenance, and $2,250,000 on capital grants.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I make this suggestion to the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow), and I know he will appreciate it is made in good faith? In next year's estimates would it not be preferable to break that down and show the proportion for maintenance in one item, and the proportion for construction in the other?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think that is quite reasonable.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on vote 69, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Goodfellow) to a headline in the Globe and Mail tonight, which reads:

"Want the city to pay more for indigents"

And it refers to a Bill introduced in the legislature here. I am sorry, but I was not aware that such a Bill was introduced. The story is this:

"The proposed amendment to the Ontario Health Act which would increase the city's share of the cost of indigent hospital patients."

The proposed daily increases are as follows:

"Group "a"-- which refers mostly to Toronto hospitals-- from $3.00 to $4.00 per bed.

Group "b" $2.50 to $3.50, an increase of $1.00 per day for indigent patients."

Now, the Board of Control is very disturbed by the increase in the proposed Bill. Mayor McCallum, in discussing it, regrets that the government has seen fit to do this. He says he considers the provincial government was ill-advised to take this action, in the face of representations from the Ontario Association of Mayors and Reeves.

He goes on to give the criticism of this action by other members of the Board of Control.

I wonder, in the face of that, if there is going to be any more paid by the province under this item this year for indigent patients than there was before. Will the province put up the extra dollar?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Of course, we do not pay anything for indigent patients. We pay, across the board, for hospital wards. I believe the ratio is at least two to one to what the municipalities are paying.

MR. SALSBERG: Are you sure the province does not pay anything for indigents?

MR. GOODFELLOW: No, we pay across the board.

MR. SALSBERG: You pay for indigent patients, too.

MR. DENNISON: I think it is seventy-one cents a day.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Under the new maintenance grants we pay across the board for every hospital ward. I am surprised that Toronto is objecting, because this Bill was designed to help out the city of Toronto, because of the deficits in the hospitals of the city, and they have been complaining that the outside municipalities do not share the deficits, and it is to help the city of Toronto take care of the deficits that this

Bill was designed.

In addition to that, we made an increase of 25% outright to the maintenance grants of last year.

MR. DENNISON: This Bill is not before us.

MR. GOODFELLOW: It was introduced today.

MR. DENNISON: We have not received a copy of it yet. Does the province make no payments for the grants?

MR. GOODFELLOW: This Bill is designed to help out the city of Toronto take care of its deficits from the outside municipalities, if the outside municipalities assume a larger share of the cost of indigent patients.

MR. DENNISON: I think that does not help the city of Toronto, I think the city of Toronto would appreciate more a share for indigent patients, a definite daily share, of this $8,000,000. If you are raising the amount the province has to pay-- what the Board of Control seemed to object to was the legislature saying it is their duty to pay that extra dollar a day, and at the same time putting up no money yourself.

MR. GOODFELLOW: I had a letter just last week from the city of Toronto, enclosing a copy of a letter they had from the county of York, in which the county of York more or less indicated in the letter that they would pay, if it was made statutory. I am rather surprised at the city of Toronto.

MR. SALSBERG: We are either going to discuss this Bill, or we are not. If we are, I would like to say something.

Votes 69 to 89 inclusive agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE; May I ask what the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Doucett) has in mind as regard hours?

It is perfectly all right with me, as far as I am concerned you can sit as late as you like, but the House is to meet at ten o'clock in the morning and there is a law of diminishing returns, if you reach a point where you fail to make any progress, and for every step you take forward, you are liable to take two steps backward. I am offering that as a suggestion.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Chairman, as the next estimates are rather small, I think we could finish by 11:30.

MR. PARKER: You would not get through by 12:00 o'clock.

MR. MILLARD: You would not get through until two o'clock in the morning, if you are going to act that way.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am offering to the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) the suggestion that in a matter of this kind he is likely to make more speed if the hon. members are fresh, than if they are tired. A word to the wise is usually sufficient, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Doucett) is quite a wise man in his own way.

MR. DOUCETT: In reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) may I say that the hon. premier (Mr. Frost) intention was to try and finish the estimates tomorrow, and there are seven of them remaining.

MISS MACPHAIL: He will not get them finished.

MR. DOUCETT: We think we could do that, if we meet at ten o'clock.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is what I am saying. We meet tomorrow morning at ten o'clock, and for that reason I suggest it is not wise to go on past eleven. After all, the rules of the

House do say "eleven o'clock". I know that is not honoured as much as it should be, but that is what it says.

MR. DOUCETT: Would you be satisfied if we took the provincial secretary's estimates now?

MR. JOLLIFFE; No, I do not think so.

MR. DOUCETT: No? All right. Then we will go ahead with labour.

MR. MILLARD: You will be here for awhile.

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 61, Department of Labour.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, in introducing these budget requirements for 1950, in view of the lateness of the hour, I can assure you that any remarks I have to make preceding the actual dealing with the various items, will be very brief.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, take your time.

MR. DALEY: My department, as you are all fully aware, is strictly administrative. Most of the items are fixed, and we can do very little about them, and I do not think it is necessary for me to deal at any great length in my opening remarks.

In dealing with the estimates of the Department of Labour, I should like to point out to you and to the members that during the past several years there has been a steady growth in the volume of work handled by the Department, the size of the staff has increased, and, as a consequence, the cost of administration of the Department has gone up.

The estimates submitted to the Committee last year

totalled $963,000. Thisyear the estimates are $1,068,000, an increase of $105,000. This additional amount will be spent on the following items:

1. Annual increases to staff,
2. Additional staff,
3. Increased cost of Conciliation Boards, etc.,
4. Increased costs re vacations with pay system,
5. Increased costs for apprenticeship training,
6. Increases in travelling expenses,
7. Increased costs of supplies, etc.

The additional staff will be distributed between the conciliation service and the composite inspection Branch.

During the past year the work of the conciliation service and of conciliation boards continued to grow, and there has been a constantly increasing number of cases handled by the Department. We have added one man to the conciliation service, and it may be necessary to increase the number of the staff again.

During the next fiscal year I propose to expand the services of the Composite Inspection Branch and of the Factory Inspection Branch which carry on work under The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act. Additional inspectors will be trained and one or two engineers will be taken on to give overall assistance and guidance on technical matters with regard to safety of persons employed in industry.

I noted that on the order paper a question was asked as to the number of inspections made by the inspectors. I should like to point out again that in the last fiscal year

28,818 inspections were undertaken. For the past two years or so we have been bringing along a group of young men in this field work and they have taken up their jobs as full-fledged inspectors. We propose to increase our staff again, partly to replace some of the veterans who will be retiring on superannuation and partly to take care of the ever-expanding industrial outlook of this province.

In 1948-49 I reported to the Members that construction of factories, shops and office buildings for which we approved plans was valued at over $61,000,000. For the first eleven months of the present fiscal year the value will be just over $60,000,000.

Since I took office as Minister of Labour in 1943 the value of industrial construction has been over $300,000,000. I mention this figure because I wish to impress upon the Members that Ontario has gone ahead with leaps and bounds, and there is a real opportunity for us to have a full measure of prosperity in the future.

I can inform the Members that the enrolment of apprentices in various trades is growing, and therefore the cost of their training is increasing. We welcome the fact that more and more boys throughout Ontario are taking up the construction trades, the Motor Vehicle Repair Trade, and other designated trades under The Apprenticeship Act.

I have paid particular attention to the activities of two or three of the Branches. I could have dealt in detail with the Operating Engineers Branch, the Minimum Wage Branch,

the Industry and Labour Board, and the Ontario Labour Relations Board. All of them are busy and the tempo is increasing throughout the entire Department. We feel that it has been a successful operation for the past year, and I recommend to your attention the needs of the Department as set out in the estimates of the next fiscal year.

TAKE "H" FOLLOWS

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, with the opening by the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) of that estimate, I would ask that the Committee rise and the House adjourn.

The situation is this; we have not made as much progress in estimates, actually, as I had hoped we would do today. I had hoped we would finish the Departments of Labour and of Travel and Publicity, but I think if we were to adjourn now rather than have a very lengthy session, and meet at ten o'clock in the morning and sit until about one and then meet in the afternoon at 2:30, we would probably make more progress than we can sitting here tonight.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: May I say to the House in view of that, we have certainly a rather gigantic-looking task tomorrow but nevertheless I think we will do better, for, after all, this has been a very long day today, hon. members have been sitting in committee, and the press has been sitting here for long hours and I really think it would be better to call it off and, therefore, I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee rise and report progress.

MR. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, can the Deputy Speaker not take the chair?

MR. FROST: I might take a little time at the moment--this is strictly irregular, but I might as well do the formal tabling of this report when Mr. Speaker comes, This evening the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has given

to me the report of the Committee which has convened, the Committee of Mayors and Reeves of Municipalities.

Mr. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt):"Shotgun Committee?"

MR. FROST: The thirteen municipalities, in connection with what they are going to do about Toronto. I have this report here and I am going to table it. I have not had the opportunity of doing more than glancing through it. I can see there is probably little unnanimity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: But there may be some bright ideas, and I will table this when Mr. Speaker arrives.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us not be discouraged. There was not much unnanimity among the 'Fathers of Confederation.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. prime Minister (Mr. Frost), when it is tabled, could make copies available to us, because it is important.

MR. FROST: Yes, I will arrange that.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. H.A. STUART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has come to certain resolutions, and moves to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment, I would like to table the report that has just come to my hand, of the Toronto Area Committee, which has been sitting under the chairmanship of Mr. Bunnell and which covered the

conclusionsof the thirteen municipalities, which was convened, I think, on the 17th January. Perhaps I could ask the Clerk and he could arrange to have copies struck off so they would be available for hon. members of the House.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Does that contain the minority report too?

MR. FROST: Oh, everything is there. Mr. Speaker, I had explained to hon. members of the House when in Committee that I would like to have the House meet in the morning at ten o'clock, and therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns this present sitting thereof, it do stand adjourned to meet at ten o'clock tomorrow morning and rise at one o'clock in the afternoon and resume at two o'clock in the afternoon, and the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended insofar as they may apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The house adjourned at 11:23 o'clock p.m.

Volume 32.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TEN O'CLOCK, A. M.

- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Friday, March 31, 1950.
10.00 o'clock, a. m.

- - - - - - -

10.00 O'CLOCK, A. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Committee on Art Purposes, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Cathcart, from the Select Committee on Art Purposes presents this as their report.

"To the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario,

Gentlemen:

Your Select Committee appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum set apart in the Estimates for Art Purposes presents the following as its report:-

Your Committee recommends that it be authorized to purchase the following pictures of Ontario subjects by Ontario artists out of the appropriation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1950:

- Maple Sugar Time by S. C. Shaw at a price of $300.
- Winston Churchill by Thomas Cordell at a price of $75.
- A winter scene by Stanley Page at a price of $75.
- Two landscapes by Shirley Farmer at a total price of $75.
- Parry Sound - Burks Falls by Jen Coles at a price of $35.
- and another landscape also by Jen Coles at a price of $20.

Your Committee recommends that it be authorized to proceed with the painting of portraits of former Prime Ministers, the portrait in each case to be painted by artists chosen by the subjects, the cost in each case not to

exceed the sum of $1,500.

Your Committee recommends that it be authorized to meet during the recess between this and the next Session of the Legislature for consideration of a plan to encourage amateur painters throughout the province and that it be authorized to purchase paintings of Ontario scenes by Ontario artists at a total cost of not more than $2,000. during the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1951.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) B. L. Cathcart.
Chairman."

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Is the picture which appeared in the paper last night included in the expenditure?

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the report, may I say that it is interesting, the number of artists we have. We have in this Chamber, Mr. Cordell, who has been long associated with this Chamber, an amateur painter -- I do not know whether he is an amateur or a professional, really -- but he is a very accomplished gentleman.

In the press gallery we have Mr. Greenaway and Mr. Foote. It would surprise you --

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Are there any in the government?

MR. FROST: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). He is a great painter.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What you might call the "artful dodger".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has

great ability along this line. It is interesting --

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): And the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is a cartoonist.

MR. FROST: No, he just "doodles".

Motion agreed to.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Ontario Municipal Board, for the year ended December 31, 1949.

MR. ROSCOE ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and move it be printed as an appendix to the Journals of the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 6, 79, 84, 100, 103, 106, 13, 26, and 52.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I want to go into estimates at once, but it occurred to me that the Order Paper would look better if we cleared off the third readings. If there is any objection by any hon. member, let me know.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would like to deal with my motion on the Order Paper at this time.

MR. FROST: No. Call the third readings.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): As has propbably been noted, the first four are not re-printed. The others are all right.

MR. FROST: It is an error in printing. Actually, they are printed. However, we might go right through the third readings. I will call Order No. 1.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1947

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The First Order, third reading of Bill No. 97, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1947", Mr. Welsh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. I am not withdrawing my objection. I do not want to seem to be cranky about it, but in recent years there has been so much "tidying-up", and so on, that I think we should have these Bills before us, when we take third readings.

MR. FROST: All right. Take Order No. 4.

THE POLICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1949", Mr. Porter.

MR. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I move third reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend the Police Act, 1949".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend the Continuation Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I move third

reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend the Continuation Schools Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend the Registry Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend the Registry Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, third reading of Bill No. 128, "The Division Courts Act, 1950", Mr. Porter.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Porter, I move third reading of Bill No. 128, "The Division Courts Act, 1950".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE PROVINCIAL AID TO DRAINAGE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, third reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act", Mr. Doucett.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 130, "An Act to amend the Provincial Aid to Drainage Act",

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 131, "An Act to amend the Public Health Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE TOWN OF PARRY SOUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order, third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound", Mr. Johnston (Parry Sound).

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Johnston (Parry Sound) I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 3, "An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE CONGREGATION OF THE PRIESTS OF THE SACRED HEART

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order, third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to Incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart", Mr. Calder.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 8, "An Act to Incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart, La Congregation des Peres du Sacre Coeur".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MRM SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND TRUST COMPANIES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order, third reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Company", Mr. Chartrand.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Chartrand, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 30, "An Act respecting the Administration and Trust Company".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, on that motion, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to the fact that he promised yesterday that after the estimates yesterday, my motion on Hydro would be called. Can he tell me now when it will be called?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that is quite true. I did say that to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

Today, as you know, is the 31st of March, and it is the end of the fiscal year, and it is desireable to have our estimates go through, if that is at all possible. I am planning to call each one of these orders, and I am quite sure we will be able to give the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) the opportunity to present his resolution, and we will have, at least, a short debate on it. That is the best I can say this morning. It seems to me if we try to adhere to the plan we originally had, it would be better. I want to call every one of these Orders before next Thursday, and I think we can do that. I promise the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) I will not overlook that.

MR. DENNISON: Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, before the Estimates are called, I would like to call to the attention of the House something which I should have mentioned before, and that is that 32 years ago today, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of this province, was severely wounded in France. This is a day he will remember as long as he lives. I wanted to mention that to the hon. members of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has he got over it yet?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I hope so. I also believe it was 50 years ago that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy)

started farming.

MR. KENNEDY: 51 years ago tomorrow. I finish the 50th year tonight.

MR. PORTER: Apparently he has not receovered yet.

MR. FROST: It makes us realize we are getting older. No wonder we have gray hair.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, would it be out of order if I asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to clear up a point which has been bothering me for a long time. We have grown accustomed to hearing him referred to as "Colonel Kennedy". Yet on occasion I have seen him referred to as "Brigadier-General Kennedy". Which are you?

MR. KENNEDY: Neither. No matter how high your rank is, at the age of 65, you come down to just plain "Mr." May I say that up in my county the boys and girls -- the younger ones -- hear their dads and mothers call me "Tom", and I can never quite get used to the youngsters saying "Hello, Tom". I get quite a shock each time.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I would like to read something to the House to show you how they look on me in eastern Ontario!

This says:

"Dunbar's Latest Brainstorm"

and it says:

"It was announced over the radio this morning that hon. George Dunbar, foxy grandpa of the Frost Cabinet at Toronto, has introduced a measure designed to permit schoolteachers to serve on municipal councils. Inasmuch as schoolteachers paid out of funds raised by these councils through taxes, what would be the matter with allowing the

the town clerk, or other employee of a municipality, acting as their own bosses, and paymasters? Premier Frost ought to get rid of Dunbar. Too bad there is not a Senate in Ontario."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: This is from the Almont Gazette.

MR. C. W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, we are going all over the lot again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh no, we are not.

MR. COX: This is something I have wanted to talke about before. I was not here on second reading of this Bill, and I went into the Committee the other day, but I was too late. I was asking the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) this morning when I might say something about the schoolteachers. I am not saying the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) should be elevated to the Senate at all. I have always been in accord with what the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) says. I want to make my position clear in regard to the school teachers. I do not agree with what the paper from Almont says.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about the town clerk?

MR. COX: We should all have positions. I was going to say, that I do not think it is a good principle; I do not think it is good practice ; I do not think it will be very good for the taxpayers. I cannot go with him on that legislation. I would not oppose him going to the Senate.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Page 61, the Department of Labour, vote 96.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): I gather that the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) has finished his remarks.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Yes, I think so:

MR. PARK: I do not intend to be very long. I appreciate the fact that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is anxious to get through these estimates today, so I will keep my remarks as short as I can.

But I think it is important that a department like this should come before the House, and we should discuss some of the policies of the department as a whole. I think the key to some of the criticisms which have been levelled at the Department from time to time, can be found in the remarks by the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) last evening, that this was an administrative department. I think it has got to be something much more than an administrative department. I will suggest to the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) some things I think he should be doing.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) yesterday, in presenting his estimates, indicated what a shift in population was occurring.

There was a time when the affairs of Labour were regarded as purely an administrative matter, and we had a bureau of industry in this province, and that used to be merely a division of the Department of Agriculture. If we are going to stay in the administrative field, there is no point in creating a Department of Labour at all. I am sure when the Department of Labour was organized, it was thought it should be something more than administrative, and it should have policies, and present them to the government, and they would pursue in the field of labour those policies, the same as agriculture pursued them in the field of agriculture, and that it should represent within the Cabinet the interests of the working people of this province, as the hon. Minister

of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) represents the interests of the farming people of this province, within the Cabinet.

I noticed the criterion the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) used when he was speaking of his agricultural Reps., he said, "What have you done to make an extra dollar for the farmers of Ontario?" I say to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), "What have you done to make an extra dollar for the workers of this province -- "

MR. DALEY: You only have to look around you, and notice since 1943 what has been done by this government. You know that.

MR. PARK: The policy of the government has been to evade the responsibilities which are placed in its hands, under the legislation given to it by the Legislature. For instance, you have had for the last little while the right to step into such pictures, as charges of unfair labour practices; you have in your hands the right, as the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) to permit prosecutions, and see that that law was enforced. But all you have done is to have evaded that responsibility; you have not granted permission, when perm ssion was sought; you have attempted, I think, by the administration of the Department of Labour, to prevent the effective functioning of that piece of legislation, albeit

(Take B follows)

. it was a bad piece of legislation in that aspect. That is not the only policy that occurred in that field, it is the same thing with the labour code enabling you to establish dispute commissioners, and if they found certain things wrong and ordered the re-instatement of employees, and if the companies refused to accept the recommendations, you did nothing to enforce your own law.

MR. DALEY: That is not so, stick to the facts.

MR. PARK: I am. On March 13th I asked you how many requests were made, and I find there were eighteen requests concerning unfair labour practices, 14 from trade unions, and only 3 were granted. You said 9 were withdrawn, and 1 undecided, that certainly is not satisfactory.

MR. DALEY: Is that not a good record? Nothing is ever settled in the courts on labour questions, and these 9 were settled in our department.

MR. PARK: The bulk of these nine died on the desk of the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) because of lack of action on the hon. minister's (Mr. Daley) part. There is a question which I raise, and that is the question in the inspection services of the Department of Labour. The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) had an indication of the interest in this matter by the number of question on this paper and we will get the answers some time. He mentioned one of the answers when he said 28,000 inspections were done.. I will deal with the question of the number of inspections.

I do not know how many were duplicate inspections, where one plant was inspected more than once, but I would imagine that there were a great number of duplications. In 1947 according to the economic surveys that were presented to the House last year by the Department of the Treasury,

there were listed 35,412 employers of labour making contributions to the Workmen's Compensation in Ontario, and there has been an increase since then, I would assume. The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) said that there were 28,000 inspections done, and some of them would be duplicate inspections, and that means that there are a large number of employers in this province that will run up into the ten thousands who are not getting any inspection in the period of a year. I do not know how the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) could do it with the staff he has.

He gave me a reply on March 6th to a question I asked, and this is what came out of it, that there are 34 full-time inspectors handling the inspection of 35,000 or more employers in this province. They are inspectors of, first, Factory, Shop and Office Building Act; second, Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act; third, Minimum Wage Act; fourth, Industrial Standards Act; Fifth, the Operating Engineers' Act; sixth, the Apprenticeship Act; seventh, the Department of Labour Act; eighth, the Adolescent School Attendance Act; and ninth, One Day's Rest in Seven Act. You also have the Building Trades Protection Act in unorganized labour, and you have at least two inspectorson both composite and boiler inspection.

There are nine pieces of legislation covering 35,000 employers, and you have only 34 inspectors. They cannot possibly do a satisfactory job with that kind of a staff, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) should seriously do something to increase his staff. The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) knows that his department can come in for severe criticism for its failure to handle certain conditions which exist, such as the time of the fire on Spadina in which several people

lost their lives, and I believe it is very necessary that the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) must have a bigger staff. The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) mentioned to me yesterday that there would be a bigger staff, and I was glad to hear him say that, but I was flabbergasted to hear him say that, because the Estimates for this year for the department are less than last year, so how will he get the added staff? The Estimates of that department this year is one of the few Estimates that is down. Factory Inspection is down, and the Minimum Wage and the Composite Inspection is down. How can the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) increase his staff when you are showing a decrease in the Estimates for inspection?

Another thing; it used to be the practice of the inspectors to consult with the trade unions, and discuss the questions, and particularly with boiler inspection, and if a letter was written it was replied to. It was the practice of boiler inspectors when they discussed problems in a foundry to discuss them with the manufacturer and the union, and they would suggest some things that came to their attention, and some things that could be done, and the minister was able to keep track of these things. That policy has been discontinued, and the only way now the union can bring matters to the attention of the department is by writing a letter. There is no casual contact with the union when the inspector goes in that area.

In Oshawa, it was the earlier practice for the boiler inspectors to consult with the union, and that is not done now. When the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) replied to me on September 16th, 1949, when Mr. Gilbert, who was the chief inspector, the policy had been reversed, and this will reflect on the inspection service. I think that it is only

common sense that we should consult with the representatives of the workers employed in any factory, in order to ascertain from them what the situation is.

There is another point on which I would wish to make some remarks, and that is the administration of overtime with pay. That Act is being administered in a way that is almost a waste of time to reach any conclusions as to the permissions for over-time pay, and I have asked how many applications for over-time permission were received in 1949, and the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) told me that 995 were received. I asked how many applications were granted, and he said 992 were granted, so that the Labour Board actually only refused three applications for over-time in 1949. This was in a period when work was declining, and unemployment was accelerating; and some of the over-time work would have been done by people who did not have regular jobs, and yet the Labour Board only disallowed three applications.

It seems to me that piece of legislation does not mean much, the workers are to have 40-hours limit, and of one thousand requests for over-time, only three were rejected. It does not seem to me that there was a proper investigation into the over-time applications. The Legislature meant that they wanted the workers to work no more than 48 hours, and it should be the job of the department to make as tough as possible the granting of these permissions for over-time.

MR. DALEY: These are supplied by the union.

MR. PARK: Some, but a great many, I am sure, are not. I think that the board is bound to see that the 48-hour week limit is maintained at all possible times, and any deviation from the 48-hour week should only be given in the most

stringent cases. When you get 995 applications and you grant 992, it seems to me that there could not have been sufficient investigation.

MR. DALEY: There are many people who know it would be useless to apply. These applications can be justified.

MR. PARK: There were 995 last year, and 1,060 the year before that made application, and the department does not know how many over-time hours it has authorized. I have asked the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) how many man-hours have been authorized for over-time and he has not yet told me, in spite of the fact that we were promised the board should know the over-time records of the companies, and that we would be told. But they have not done anything. Obviously the administration of the hours of work section of that Act is anything but satisfactory, and I think the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) should give serious consideration to the changing of that condition.

It is called the Industry and Labour Board, which represents industry, but it is a civil service board, and I think you should put up a board with representation from employers and labour organizations and then you would have a joint board. This is a full-time civil service board which represents industry. There is one other feature to which I would like to make reference, and I call the attention of the House to item 9 in vote 96, and I want to read to the House what we are asked to vote, and I read:

> Advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers, publicity, legal fees, administration of justice, witnesses and interpreters in the Department of Labour, includ ng Apprenticeship Branch, Boiler Inspection Branch, Factory Inspection Branch, Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers,

Branch, and the administration of the Private Employment Agencies Act .....$11,000.00 "

Why are advertising and legal fees shown together in the same category?

And then we have that item number 10, "Litigation of Constitutional and other questions - $5.00",

MR. DALEY: That amount was just to keep the account open.

MR. PARK: This is just exactly the same procedure as we had a year ago. While advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers, and so on fell into the same group, and I do not think that is proper. Why do we not have a break-down on our advertising and educational work, and so on, and legal fees? It does not ap ear anywhere that we can get a break-down, and there is no relationship between publicity and legal fees. There is no relation whatever that can justify the inclusion of these in an estimate.

On the other hand, there is a lack of publicity coming out of the department, and I have been on the mailing list of the Labour Board for some time, and I cannot recollect receiving one piece of literature during the last year, until yesterday morning, when this arrived at my home, the Department of Labour Annual Report, ending March 31, 1949. I must congratulate the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) on the production of this report which is the prettiest and best-dressed book we have had to date, although the tables in it were thorns in the flesh of Labour, it is an improvement by far over anything previously put out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: The thing that strikes me, is that this is the only piece of literature I have received from the Labour

department, although I am on their mailing list, and I got this only yesterday, possibly it is because I was so strongly asking for this information. I do not know whether or not it was sent out on purpose. But I would like to stress that the Department of Lands and Forests sent out a very nice book, in colour, and the piece of liberature from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) was also dressed up. Surely the Labour Department is entitled to have something similar..

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: The photographs in the agricultural booklet were made by Karsh.

MR. PARK: I do not think that the Department of Labour is spending as much money as is spent in the single advertisement written by the Department of Publicity in the Holiday Magazine.

MR. DALEY: We are not getting half the credit to which we are due.

MR. PARK: The hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should be a little more hard, and get the attention to which he is entitled. I investigated that the one single advertisement written by the Department of Travel and Publicity, and the space that it occupied, cost $5,760., and the whole Department of Labour has a large number of employees. There are plenty of other places doing a good job in the publicity of labour, and bringing the proper figures before the people.

The State of Pennsylvania, is putting out a book so that you know what is going on in that State. There are all details there as to labour and industry, and details as to the question of changes in the cost of living, employment conditions in the state, published every month. Why cannot we, in Ontario, do something equivalent when we

have a population of practicaly one-fourth of the whole Dominion.

California has a number of interesting labour publications, one here is Union Labour for California, 1948, which gives you a cross-section, and these are important in the relationship between industry and labour. That kind of material would be useful in the concilation service. I think we should have popularly written documents, telling the workers of their rights, and the kind of thing that is being done by the federal Department of Labour, and the unemployment commission insurance. These pamphlets or booklets are easily read, and the worker knows where he stands.

One of the things that struck me about the workmen's compensation is the large number of workers who do not know their rights, and I think a popular vote could be undertaken to improve that. I will make a proposition to the hon. minister (Mr. Daley); I have here a workmen's compensation handbook prepared by one of the largest unions in the country, and checked by the workmen's compensation, and it is a thorough digest. We do not have to have it produced annually, but I would like to send this over to the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) which I will do later, and I think that his department could produce it as an effort of that department, so that the workers in unorganized industry could get the material and know their rights. I will send the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) a group of these booklets in a little while.

There are a number of things I could speak on, but I should like to mention again the efforts of the States of Pennsylvania and California that I mentioned, and the booklet that I will send across to the Department of Labour. The nice booklet that I got at my home, entitled, "Activities

and Responsibilities of the Ontario Department of Labour"has on it a sticker at the top of the cover "Note - information in this booklet not up to date. Booklet printed 1945".

I think it is time that we got some genuine publicity on the labour laws. The department should get out some sort of information that the worker can read and understand, not these horrible legal jobs that they do not understand. The workers in the plants will not follow that any more than the farmers in Ontario can follow the rural legislation. What should be done is to make a digest of the laws so that the ordinary worker can read them,and I think that something should be done in that connection. The publication of such things as board reports and conciliation reports are very important, because they form a labour jurisprudence, and the question is very important the workers of Ontario. When these are not available, and not published regularly, the worker does not know where he stands. The decisions of the board are important not only to labour, but also to the legal fraternity. You can get them only by subscribing to the high-priced legal services that all the lawyers regularly buy in their practtice, and that is the only way that we can keep track of what is going on before the Boards. There are things like the Board of Conciliation decisions that should be put in writing and perhaps have a quarterly review. The federal government does that on their boards, and our report, our labour relations also are more provincial than federal, and I think that we in Ontario should have this information.

We are the primary industrial province of Canada, and what we do becomes important to all the other parts of Canada.

I have spoken much longer than I had intended to speak

and there are a number of other items that I will raise on particular estimates. I do think that the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) should give serious consideration that his department is not a purely administrative one; he should get out and fight, and not sit by when the department is not being administered so well.

MR. DALEY: I may have made an error in calling my department "administrative". All my remarks were kept down due to the lateness of the hour, as I thought that we were going to finish last night. I am sure we are a policy-making department, in addition to being administrative.

There are a few questions I would like to reply to briefly. I am sorry, but I am sure that the hon. member (Mr. Park) knows that the forestry and mining operations are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour. I am interested in what the hon. member (Mr. Park) says about more publicity on the conciliation board reports, and I have come to believe we should do that, and do it in a proper manner. He mentioned the minimum wage approach, down in the estimates. That is true. That is with the whole operation, and assistance we received from the federal government. We do not have to do as much work. They assist us in making records with the unemployment insurance people, and that has kept the work down tremendously.

In regard to consulting with trade unions ----

MR. PARK: I also mentioned about factory inspection and composite inspection, and that it was down. And the wages are down. There must have been a cut in salaries.

MR. DALEY: The wages are up. In regard to the over-time grants, we realize that everyone is entitled to 100 hours per year over-time, and many of these appliations are

granted because it is the right to ask for them, and if they can justify the application, the application is granted. We do not know if the hundred hours are used or not. It would be difficult to tabulate.

MR. PARK: If you give permits on over-time, you should get a report back. We do not know about these 995 permits, whether they involved 10 men or 5,000 men.

MR. DALEY: The permits are difficult to get unless you can justify it, Unless they are able to justify the application the request is not made. Every request for a permit is gone into with sureness, and the hope of cutting it down. You have to be practical, and often the refusal of a request for some over-time would mean the lessening of the hours of labour of a number of people, and these requests are asked so that a plant can be kept going, and in some cases if the request was not granted, there would be the nedessity for the plant to close down.

(Take C follows)

I do not say we go into every case, but we use the best judgment we have, in these matters. You mentioned during your remarks the most unfortunate fire which took place recently. I know there will be a discussion on the question of appointing a committee to examine into the whole question of the Department of Labour, and its administration. It does place me in somewhat of an embarrassing position, because I do not want to give any impression that I do not think the Department of Labour will stand up under that investigation, because I believe it will. Well, I would like to make a few remarks on that question.

In 1943, when I was elected and appointed Minister of Labour, I was advised at the time that I would have a difficult and a contentious job, that I would never completely satisfy anybody.

MR. PARK: I agree; it is the kind of a job you have.

MR. DALEY: I expect to be criticized, but I expected the criticism to be fair, at least as fair as I try to be.

On assuming this office, the first thing I did, the very first morning when I came into the office, I called the heads of all the various branches into the office. That was the first occasion I had of meeting them. I found in discussions with them that I had a very fine group of people heading these departments, and it was my opinion that they were all deeply interested in their work, that they had the seriousness of purpose, and that they were imbued with a desire to do a good job.

I advised them then-- this can be checked because they were all there; ask any one of them-- that there would be no politics in the Department of Labour, that all I required from them was their co-operation in working with me, that they would do a good job in the interest of the people of this province. As I say, that can be checked. I found I had some fine men in various departments. I had Mr. Prang, who was the chief factory inspector and had been for a great many years, a man well regarded throughout the entire province. Unfortunately, he came to the retiring age, and I extended his period for a time, because of his value to the Department. I was sorry afterwards I did, because he died shortly after. I have always felt if I had said "no; you have reached the age; you are going to retire", that he still might be living.

But I did not bring in somebody who knew nothing about it. We lifted somebody up from the Department, a man who had been an understudy to Mr. Prang for a good many years, a Mr. Gieberd, and I believe he is establishing himself as being an able administrator.

We have Mr. Sharp, one of the outstanding engineers on this continent, who belongs to some of the organizations in which he has held high office; we have Mr. Briggs, of the Boiler Inspectors, and Mr. Haws, of apprenticeship training.

These men are all men with long experience, who have given practically their entire lives in this type of work, and I want to say without any hesitation, they have been loyal to the Department; they have done a good job in the interest of the people of this province.

After that most disastrous fire which took place, on which there was an inquest held, we were greatly concerned about it. There appeared to be no blame fastened on the Department of Labour for it. It was one of those unfortunate things. Following that, we have called together a committee-- this was some three weeks ago-- when the committee met with the Fire Marshall, with officials of the Fire Department of the city of Toronto, and with a Member of the Commissioner's office of the city of Toronto, and my own Department, and we canvassed the possibilities of improving facilities for fire protection. If we can devise a set of rules, by an exchange of information with those from this great city, we feel that it will be a step forward in fire prevention work, in the entire province. There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the extent the Department of Labour is responsible for fire prevention. We have some forty-odd inspectors who have a great number of duties. Has the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) read the list, may I say that some of them are not as onerous as might appear from the names given to them, they are just checking in the office, and things of that kind, but they that work to do, as well as the fire inspection work.

We have in the Department a responsibility to examine plans of any new industry, to see that they are properly designed, and provide proper fire escapes, sanitary conditions, and the elimination of hazards. This particular building where this most unfortunate fire occurred, which took so many lives, was a comparatively new building; it was designed properly; approved by the Department, with two exits, one at each end

But in this case, as in others, human element enters in, and it is almost entirely impossible to cope with that. That building was approved when it was built, and later on there was a partition put in there, dividing it, making two buildings of it. Of course, materials are often piled carelessly, sometimes in front of doorways, and in this particular case a partition had been built without permission from the Department, dividing the building.

Bars were placed on the windows, but bars or no bars, we would not have considered those windows, which were high above the ground, as proper exits, in case of fire. I do not think it meant anything in this particular case, whether the bars were on the windows or not.

MR. PARK: They got out through the bars, in the end.

MR. DALEY: It was only twenty-nine feet from the farthest man in the room to a proper exit. It would appear that material -- highly inflammable-- was stored there, and I think we will have to give great consideration to the storage of these materials which are known to be inflammable. This material had been placed in a bad position, and when the fire started, it seemed to me the attempt was centred on putting the fire out, rather than evacuating the people. If when the fire first started, they had tried to get out, there is no doubt they could have gotten out safely.

This material which caused the flash fire created a gas which rendered those people helpless, before they had a chance to get out of the doors or windows, even if the windows had been open.

I explain these things to the House, Mr. Chairman. I do not think our Department is perfect. I think we have excellent men at the head of various departments, who know far more about this than I do, and the question arises, in regard to their responsibility, I think they are doing an excellent job. I can see no reason for setting up a committee, but I will assure this House that I will be most anxious to accept any suggestions, which will improve the situation in regard to the safety, and the government regulations, even, if they would further or add to the protection of workers in this province.

MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Chairman, following what the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has said, that I know that the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) is very much concerned about this question. I think we are all concerned with the question of safety in our plants and buildings in the province. We have had our own experience over the past years. The hon. members will recall we had some experience in connection with a fire in Hamilton in a dance hall; we have had experience in marine disasters, and other kinds. We ran into an unfortunate situation, as the hon. members will recall in connection with the Paymaster Mine. The province had a very bad experience in a mine fire at the time of the Hollinger fire a number of years ago, from which a tremendous amount of experience was gained, and we gained considerable from a disaster which took place in the province of Quebec, a year or so ago. Our people were very active. We took our rescues squads and we learned much as the result of that fire.

Above everything else, I am sure that almost invariably a disaster can be traced down to the human element.

May I mention a word about this building. We have a very active committee in connection with safety in this building, which is not fire-proof by any means. The hon. members have all noticed that the firemen who are patrolling the building now. Our experience shows that in order to maintain safety to a high degree, it is not so much a question of inspection-- although inspectors are necessary and desirable-- but it is in keeping the human element toned up to a point where they are alert to possible danger, and the necessity of avoiding things which might happen. There are so many things which can happen.

I was informed by one of our hon. members this morning that a situation might arise where you might have two exits from a building, and then somebody pushes a piano in front of one of them.

Then we have the situation on Adelaide Street, where the building was inspected, and was satisfactory and proper, but loss of life occurred in the disaster. Apparently somebody decided to stick a partition down near one of the exits.

Page "C-7" follows.

MR. PARK: What good is the inspection then.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Park) raised the point a moment ago about inspectors. He read off a list of things these inspectors are to do. Mr. Chairman, I often wonder really if we have not too many laws. Actually speaking, we have so many laws and so many regulations that really you would nearly need to take all of the people of the province into your employ to enforce the laws.

It is one of the difficulties in the complex day and age in which we live.

Nevertheless, I know, Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the difficulty of doing these things. You have the difficulty of expenses. I know that human safety is important, more important than that, after all, the safety of our people is paramount.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) made an eloquent speech last night, and one which, in the main, is almost completely unanswerable-- in regard to mental hospitals. He said last night that we could spend all the money we are spending in treating of psychiatric patients, and the facilities which should be provided. I listened to him last night, and he made an unanswerable argument in connection with that. He made a very fine argument a year ago in connection with inspection for tuberculosis in the hospitals, one in which we felt his point was good. We must give him a considerable measure of credit for having put that matter forward. He advanced that thought, and we felt there was merit in it.

But all of these things run into an enormous sum t

of money, and while I know that all the hon. members will say "what is money as compared with these various benefits" we must all remember that the money is taken out of the taxpayers, and that always produces difficulty. Every tax is bad; even the hospital tax is bad. They are all bad, We do not like taxes, but we like to have the benefits.

I would suggest to the hon. members of this House-- and I hope it will have the endorsement of my friend, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley)-- that we have, first of all, very fine inspection service; we have the Fire Marshal's Department; we have the Factory Inspection Branch; we have the motion picture people, all of whom are engaged in various phases of the public inspection, and all dealing with this problem. Yet we had this unfortunate affair down on Adelaide Street. Many of the conditions which applied there could apply, for instance, in a theatre, if we were not careful and we have to be constantly on the alert in connection with that.

I would say that the greatest problem there is alerting public opinion, and alerting the personal element. Do not let anybody think for a moment that we even approach perfection in this matter. We realize we do not. I was going to suggest if we called together, for instance, our theatre inspectors, the Fire Marshall, the Chief Inspector, the various safety branches of the Department of Labour, and let them have a meeting-- we are meeting with these people all the time-- but if any hon. member of this House, and particularly the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) who is interested in these people-- let them sit in with our people, and talk frankly of

practical things, and I think we could accomplish more by doing that than any other way I know. If you [illegible] have a committee sitting in with these people-- I think they would [illegible] point out all the things we presently know and are endeavouring to overcome.- In connection with the Noranic fire, if they had the doors of that boat open on the deck, and if they had 25 or 30 men stationed around the ship, who knew, if there was an emergency, the how and where to get the people off of the boat, probably there may have been no loss of life. But it just did not happen that way. The ship sailed into the dock, and the ship's complement, as is ordinarily the custom, went uptown, and somebody forgot to see that these things were done. There should have been somebody on that boat who would make a very great nuisance of himself, seeing that the doors worked and that people knew where to go, in case of fire. But nothing was done. That was neglected. It was taken as sort of a joke, and these things are not a joke. These are the very elements which enable us to get things done by our inspection staff. We have to constantly keep after them, to keep them up to date, or they become complacent. We asked the Fire Marshal's Branch to root into the moving picture branch, to keep them on their toes. You have to do that constantly; you have to keep emphasizing and over emphasizing, and for that reason one of the things I am interested-- and in which the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) is interested-- is in this keeping people alert, and I would not want to discourage anyone from emphasizing that.

I make the suggestion we get the inspectors together, and the hon. members who are interested can look at the whole thing, look at the regulations, and discuss them with our inspectors, and out of that will come valuable information, far more valuable than having a committee, which will only emphasize the things we already know, and are endeavouring to overcome.

I make that suggestion to the hon. member for St. Andrew, (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I had no indication that the matters contained in the motion made, which is on the Order paper, was calling for the setting up of a select committee to study the laws and regulations governing the protection of life and limb against the hazard of fire, and industrial accidents. But it happened that the entire question is now before the House, and I will be obliged to say something. I was hoping that the government would agree to have such a committee set up, which will go into the matter in a thorough fashion, but, typical of the hon. minister of Labour's (Mr. Daley) attitude, this idea is repugnant to him, as are most of the new suggestions made to him. I will have to say something about it now.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that this present hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has the strongest opposition to contend with, that any hon. minister in the past ever had.

MR. DALEY: No, they are all with me.

MR. SALSBERG: I mean in the House. No. hon. minister before the present one had such an array of labour men facing

him, and arguing with him.

From that point of view he holds a unique position, and I doubt if there was ever an hon. minister of Labour in this province whose mind was so shocked at suggestions as the present hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). He gives me the feeling that he is the sort of a housekeeper who likes to shove the dust under the carpet, and have a very clean household, but the carpet is resting on piles of dust and dirt. He is deadly afraid to meet with the committees of this House--deadly afraid. He looks upon such committees, or the proposals by any committees affecting his Department, as his enemies personally. That is not the case. But that is the attitude of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). He has refused to convene the committee on labour for six years, assuming beforehand that the committee is his enemy, and he has, therefore, deprived himself and his Department, and the province, of the most valuable suggestions and assistance which are available to him for the improvement of the work in his Department--

MR. DALEY: You mean your suggestions?

MR. SALSBERG: And the work of his civil servants. He has aroused by now the opposition of a very conservative-minded section of the great union movement, because of that position--

MR. DALEY: They are all my friends.

MR. SALSBERG: Labour men, who are officially affiliated with the Progressive Conservative party are now amongst his most severe critics, precisely for that reason, that he resists every approach made to him, and suspects everybody of suffering from some complication.

MR. DENNISON: I do not think any section of labour is officially affiliated with the Progressive Conservative party.

MR. SALSBERG: I say they are, and the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) will find out, if he concerns himself with it, that there are labour men affiliated with the Progressive Conservative party.

MR. PORTER: Some of them voted right.

MR. SALSBERG: You and I accept them as they are, officials of the union movement.

MR. PORTER: But they voted as their consciences dictated.

MR. DALEY: Are you an official of the trade unions?

MR. SALSBERG: They even find it becomes necessary for them to repeat their speeches year after year, because of the stubborn refusal of the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) to listen to any suggestions.

I listened to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and I can say now as I said a year ago-- and as I told him after his speech a year ago-- that I thought I was listening to my own words of a few years ago--

MR. DALEY: You boys should get together, and see wh gets the credit.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not accuse him of plagiarizing, because I repeat myself annually when we meet to discuss the estimates of the Department of Labour because regardless of everything we propose, we find it necessary to come here and are obliged to repeat our speeches. You see it may be changed

a little bit when made by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park); when he draws attention of these matters to the House, but it is the same old mare with a little bit of polish on the harness, and it took seven years to get the change.

A year ago I held in my hand a very fine publication from the Department of Education, and I said to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), "Look at what a fine piece of printing--"

MR. DALEY: You mean the cover or the book.

MR. SALSBERG: It took seven years before we got the cover. I do not know what it will require to change the inside.

MR. DALEY: You will be saying the same thing ten years from now.

MR. SALSBERG: You will not last ten years as Minister of Labour; I assure you of that, publicly. Now, there is the question of Item 9, in vote 96. Very interesting, Mr. Chairman. This item is actually more now than it was two years ago. There i is an increase. It is more now, It was but $2,000 two years ago, but by now with the increased cost of printing, and the increased cost of labour, the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) and his Department are estimating, in this item, for printing, and so forth, lawyers and so forth, and other things and so forth, for $11,000.

(Take D follows)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Now, I did have some other statements to make which I will leave out for the moment and not deal with. I do want to say that the conciliation committee of the Department of Labour is making some valuable contributions, and I hope that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will not cause some of the members of his Department to lose their jobs because of what I have to say. I hope that no one will get into trouble, because I have a good word to say for them, but I must say that that branch is very, very under-staffed, and there is no chance for it to get properly into operation.

MR. DALEY: You are entirely wrong. You do not know what you are talking about, and you are only "shooting the wind".

MR. SALSBERG: You never shot anything. You are like a toad on a log, and you are an hon. Minister, but still you are scared of everything. You do not do anything at all. You are like a fat toad on a log.

MR. DALEY: If I had a mind like yours, I would keep my mouth shut.

MR. SALSBERG: You have not anything at all to say. Any words that you utter out of your mouth are put in your mouth by others. If you ever had anything in your mouth, it was put in by some one else -- some one else has told you to say something. With all the responsibility that attaches to this Department, I think something has to be done that has not been done up till now, and are we going to be faced with another tragedy, a catastrophe of major proportions, unless something is done which has been called "radical" in that Department?

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) just spoke and said in his very amiable way that we learn from experience, but there

was a tragedy which took the lives of nine people, and if we are still going to learn by experience, why is there not something done to prevent these things?

Are we going to wait until the lives of hundreds of people are lost before we do anything, before we overthrow these old regulations and laws with regard to inspection? Is the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) waiting for 200 people to lose their lives before he will move? Is that necessary? Do we have to have another catastrophe of major proportions before he is going to act?

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Why do you not go back to Russia?

MR. SALSBERG: It is totally incorrect to attribute the lives which were lost in the fire on Richmond Street to the human element. No one knows what was the cause of the fire.

There is one thing that strikes me in the face, Mr. hon Minister (Mr.Daley), and that is the fact that nine people died, and according to what we heard, everything was according to law, and according to the inspectors, everything was proper and everything was legal. The building was according to law, and the bars on the windows were according to law, and the inspectors of the Department said that if they had been asked to inspect that building, that they would give a permit. Their own inspectors said that they could obtain a permit, but nine people died there, and that proves that the laws are inadequate and we must change them.

MR. DALEY: Very impressive.

MR. SALSBERG: I think that you should be impressed. But must we wait until there are more lives lost? I assure the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) that this is not a criticism, but there must be something done. This is a plea to him to see that the laws and regulations and the system of inspections are changed to prevent such tragedies. He need not be

suspicious that anyone is trying to do him out of a job. The Fire Marshal is a fine man, but it is almost inherent in an organization to protect itself, and the Fire Marshal was primarily concerned with the point of explaining the cause of the fire, rather than probing into it to find out about it.

I think we should really get down to "brass tacks". I told the Fire Marshal at the inquest that what we were concerned about was finding out the cause of the fire, rather than placing the responsibility on anyone.

In the inspection department there is not a single graduate electrical engineer on the staff to be able to investigate fires caused by electricity -- that is a fact. The fact is that your own inspector, the Chief Inspector, made a statement to the press, that if the bars had been there when his inspector inspected the place, he would not have allowed the bars to be put around. But the bars were there, and they did not take the trouble to find out who put the bars there, or how much it cost, or anything else. I found out on the telephone in five minutes when the bars were put there, how much they cost, and who put them there, and everything else about it, -- I found out, in five minutes on the telephone. Yet the Department has not seen fit to enquire properly into that catastrophic fire.

There is no law or regulation on our books or on our orders to make such practices unlawful, and this must be put upon our books. We cannot wait until more people die before this is rectified. You could put up a building tomorrow, and bar all the windows up, and still be within the law.

When you can say that the people were within nine or ten feet of safety and they would have been saved if they had gone through the flames, you are ignorant of the other factors in this. There were two factories in that building. One was in the front, and one was in the back, and the people in one

portion of the factory saved themselves because there was one window that was open, and they climbed out. In the front, the windows were all barred, and no one could get out. There was only one exit, and that had flames shooting out of it, and they did not know how far the flames went.

One young lad covered his head, and rushed into the flames, and he did find out that the flames were only for a few feet, and he was saved. The others were afraid, and the bars on the windows prevented them from getting out.

And still this is all legal. Why do we not have some regulations and laws? Have we to wait for a larger tragedy before something is done about this? Are we to wait for more tragedies? I do not think that we should wait.

I told the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) privately that I know this city, and I work in many of these buildings, and I hate to think what would happen if a fire started in the basement or one of the upper floors of a building I worked in. Thousands of people are employed, but it seems here that it is "radical" to ask for a committee to study our laws and regulations and methods of inspection. Any reasonable Minister of Labour would welcome such a proposal, but he has called different people from different departments, and he says that we will meet them on the carpet, and we will let the questions be started.

I will not quote editorials or headlines from newspapers that say that we have people in these jobs who do not know their job. I did say something evidently that aroused the ire of the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) on a previous occasion, and he thought I was picking on him.

Mr.Chairman, please be assured -- and I assure every hon. member of this House -- that I had no reason to pick out the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley). He has not taken a seat away from our Party, and I do not think that the loss of four or five votes would amount to anything, and we do not aspire to

take his place in the Labour Ministry at the moment. What I submit is this: that he refuses to answer my mail, and I am a member of this House. A letter was sent to him by registered mail before I got an answer from him. I had sent other letters, and they were ignored, and I had to send him a letter by registered mail.

MR. DALEY: I had answered that question twice before.

MR. SALSBERG: Some one else must have put the words on his lips.

I will read every letter between the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and myself on that occasion, and I will say that the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) did not take the trouble to personally investigate the matter,which was brought to his attention, and that is the case of a young girl, 17 years of age, who lost four fingers off her hand, and his information to me was contrary to the facts.

He based himself entirely on a report he got from one of his inspectors, and he refused to look into the situation. The hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) knows of what I am talking, and it came out in the process of corresponding; he accepted the official report, which later was proven to be entirely incorrect. Yet, from March until November, the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) refused to personally intervene, and he said, "I have written you, and that is that". I had to write him a registered letter, because he had not answered my earlier correspondence, and it turns out that his inspectors did not even speak to that young girl.

MR. DALEY: She was in Winnipeg.

MR. SALSBERG: She was not. I can get her here tomorrow, or today. I can bring her down here tomorrow or today. You say she was in Winnipeg -- well, she was not. Her sister sought around for some information, and she did not get much. You are always suspecting -- always. I had to put in nine

months of pressure, and almost a threat that I would bring this up before the House before I got any reply.

MR. DALEY: I am not afraid of anything which you might bring up before the House.

MR. SALSBERG: How many were fined for violation of the law? I did not intend to speak on this, and I was hoping that it would be unnecessary to discuss it. I was hoping that you would look into the regulations and the law, and find ways of improving it, and recommend something so that the laws of the Province and the city could be such as to prevent catastrophe.

There is no such recommendations, and the Trades Labour Council of the Fire Department said the conditions required a very drastic overhauling, but this has not been done. Everyone knows that. These are things that a committee would go into, and invite the responsible heads of the province and the city, that are responsible for the life and limb of working people. But the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is scared, he will not do anything. I told him, and I say to the House, I say politically you stand to gain from the appointment of a committee, and the bringing in of legislation as a result of committee.

MR. DALEY: Political gain does not enter into my mind.

MR. SALSBERG: He is scared. He is like the devil who is scared of holy water.

MR. DALEY: What do you know about holy water?

MR. SALSBERG: He is just as snug as a bug in a rug. He is angry when anyone talks about his Department, and I do not think he even knows what is going on.

MR. DALEY: I was never angry with you before this morning, and I can only say that I think you are a nasty piece of goods.

MR. SALSBERG: This deals with the life and health and limbs of people, and I say to the government that if we are to be guarded by this hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), and if there is no

change made, then I say we will be confronted with a tragic experience of such proportions as we have not yet been confronted with, and it is then, and only then, that the Department will shake themselves, and begin to examine what is wrong.

And I conclude, and I say, in the presence of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) and in the presence of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley), that the laws and regulations we have are inadequate and that we must have something new to meet the present requirements. Are we going to wait for nine more people to die before we do anything? And in that case, everything was according to law; everything was according to law.

The sooner we change the laws, the better will be the conditions of the working people and the province as a whole.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Chairman, I realize that every hon. member of the Treasury benches, and every Minister of Labour is "bad medicine" to some people. I do not think there is anything we can do to meet all the requirements.

The hon. member (Mr.Salsberg) has spoken of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), and I will say in my experience and association with the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) over a number of years now -- and I think I can say this without contradiction,-once you get your "mad" ironed out and you get down to the facts, you will find that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) of Ontario has done a great job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not spare the rod, you are just spoiling the child.

MR. FROST: I was interested in hearing from the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). He has investigated, and he

has spoken from his own point of view, but I think he is too hard. The hon. Minister of Labour's position (Mr. Daley) is a very hard and difficult one, and the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) knows that no Minister of Labour can do everything. He knows that we are dealing with a vast and complex problem.

I know that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) has done everything he can in trying to find ways and means to meet all the problems which have come under his jurisdiction in his Department. I know that. He is constantly after these things. What he has done in the last few years to rectify matters for the labour man is not difficult to find out if you will look it up. It is easily discernible.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) has done a great job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I will connect this with the mine disasters referred to earlier. I recognize that my hon. friend could bring in possibly some points where I could have been negligent, but there was nothing of that kind. Everything was done. The hon. member (Mr. Park) does not know how hard I have personally striven to correct so many of these things. I recognize the difficulties we have, and the necessity we have for inspection, and the responsibility.

We recognize that there is sometimes a lapse as between municipal responsibility, and provincial where municipal responsibility ends and the other starts. If you do not think it difficult, just remember what the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said when he read a list of those inspectors and what they had to look after. It is dealing with the human element, and I again say that we will be ready next week or as soon a time as is convenient, to get our experts together, and if our friend from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would like to

come to that meeting, or any other hon. members of this House, we will try to consider the regulations on their merit, and we will be glad to hear from any hon. members of the House, and listen to their suggestions.

There is nothing we received, that we did not investigate, and when reference is made to the inspectors, I am constantly checking to see that they are not becoming complacent.

I would say again, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) has done a very good job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I know of no Minister who has been more diligent. We have to recognize all the difficulties that there are in the situation, and we have to take into account the human element and the fact that you cannot have one sitting over everyone all the time to see that they are doing their job right.

I can say that we are doing the best we can, and I think we have, in this province, despite all the difficulties we have to meet. I think we are doing pretty well.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, referring back to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). I wish he would not take criticisms from this side of the House as criticisms of an individual. I know a great number of them in his Department, and I have every respect for them, and the work they are doing. I have every respect for their good intentions and the work they do, but one of the great problems of safety lies in the fact that in safety organizations in the province, factories or manufacturers; there is no organization representing both the worker and the employer.

Very frequently they are very interested in saving money for the boss rather than looking after the employee who works in these factories, and I do not think that the hon.

Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is going to get at the problem in the way he suggests. If we could have someone from the labour organizations who could give some information on safety devices, it should be listened to, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) could gain by the advantage of their experiences, and this would help.

That should be done, or else there should be a full-scale safety organization with the Legislature represented -- I do not care how many members you have from the House, but we must have some one who can tell us of the particular dangers that could be looked after and avoided. None of us can give all the remedies, and we should have people from the source to advise us.

We have to have a select committee to bring people to us, to protect against these dangers, and it must include these people. Otherwise it is more or less evading the issue.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): I would like to follow that up. Some of the hon. members do not seem to realize that some measures of safety committees are for the employers and not always inclined towards the employees. I raise that question, and it is true that we have, during the past year, conducted some extensive research work. A great number of the doctors in the various plants make an unnecessary effort, -- sometimes when it should be elsewhere and towards other channels, to get the employees who have been injured back to work. Many employees have been injured at work and have gone to the company doctor and the doctor has diagnosed the case as being possibly a very mild strain, and that they should go back to work, and the employee is still suffering and gets no relief. They do not have to go to the company doctor, but all employees do not know that. They go to the company doctor, because that is where the foreman sends them. After a period of time where they have gotten

no relief from their ailments, and are suffering, they will go possibly to see another doctor, and this other doctor will diagnose the case as more serious, altogether differently from the company doctor, and will order them to stay home and get additional treatment.

Application is then made to the Board, a long drawn-out process, and then there is the application under the Workmen's Compensation, and there is money spent there, and several costs which could have been avoided.

We have no complaints, but nevertheless the machinery goes into motion, and there is time lost in the process, but in most cases, as a result compensation is recommended and is awarded.

Too many company doctors are not interested in the worker, and his complaints, A worker may be seriously injured and maimed for life, and I could bring file after file where that has happened, where the doctor improperly diagnosed cases. Somehow, I and a great many others in the labour field, think the doctor should have some kind of program, and I think the Department should look into the situation of doctors hired by companies to carry out the program of the safety committees. This is a serious problem, and is causing us much trouble, and is costing money, and it is costing many of our employees a great many days of available work. I should like also to direct a question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). I noticed that one or two previous speakers made reference to a report from his office, and I am wondering if I am the only member of the House who has not received one.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Neither have I.

MR. FELL: I did not get one, and no one on this side of the House except the hon. member for Covercourt(Mr. Park) appears to have one. It would help us considerably in discussing these problems more adequately if we had this report, so that

we would have something before us. I have found that often a report will answer questions that we may wish to ask.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) if this Department is involved at the present time in any conciliation work in regard to the strike at University Motors in Toronto. This morning I know of an incident which happened, and the Labour Department should do something about what occurred. That is the treatment of strikers by the police.

This morning we saw a big burly police sergeant grabbing and throwing men around with physical force. When he was asked his name and his number, the person who was asking was told in short order it was none of his business. That is not right, and the question has been raised with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the government.

Nevertheless, it appears that the instructions to the municipal bodies and perhaps the provincial police, may not be sufficiently clear. When people are peaceably on the street, they should not be molested by the police officers, when they are properly carrying out their duties.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Give one instance where there is a case of provincial police molesting some one.

MR. FELL: I did n t say provincial police. I was referring to a particular incident this morning which took place in Toronto, at the University Motors.

MR. PORTER: Was that the provincial police?

MR. FELL: I said municipal police. To get back to the point, here we had an incident where three men were moving along, minding their own business and not looking for trouble, and under all the rules and instructions laid down in the past by the proper authorities, these men were doing no harm. They were conducting a peaceful strike, in proper order, and were

confronted by a big burlypolice sergeant [illegible], who told them to get down the street. They asked why, and in reply, they were seized by that big burly policeman, and swung around and sent back.

MR. DALEY: Did he throw the whole three of them at once?

MR. FELL: No. He threw one after the other. He threw two, and then the third was a union representative that came over to see what all the commotion was about, and he was told about the same thing.

MR. DALEY: We have nothing to do with that.

MR. FELL: We expect some assistance from this Department. I think it is important that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) should take action to stop this sort of thing. When you are treated like this, and this strike is not illegal -- we know that strikes are part of our democracy -- [illegible] there is no reason to be treated in such a manner. When a strike is being carried on legally, we think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) should make statement that the police should reciprocate in kind, and treat the people properly. We are behaving ourselves well, so let the police do the same. Strikes are accepted today, and there is nothing wrong with them if they are conducted properly, and we are entitled to some kind of protection from this Department, which we are not getting.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) if his Department is involved in attempting to solve the problems at this plant.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): I was interested in a suggestion of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) with regard to safety statutes and regulations, whether there would be called a conference between those responsible for the enforcement

of these regulations, and those hon. members of the Legislature interested in such provisions.

(Take E-1 follows)

I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) why he suggests that this would be preferable to the setting up of a Committee of the House.

MR. FROST: I will tell the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) quite frankly that we have in our provincial service -- and have had for months past -- our own committee working in connection with this. We have, at the present time, in our provincial inspections service, committees sitting together. I was just discussing it with the Fire Marshal the other day, in the absence of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) concerning matters relating to safety. He and I went down to one of our committee rooms, not to take part in the discussions, but to lend support to them, and impress upon them the desirability of taking nothing as a matter of fact. The hon. member (Mr. Oliver) knows that here we have the best experts in Ontario, right in our own services. We have been in collaboration with them. The fact is, if you have a committee endless time is taken up in doing things that everybody is trying to do, and accomplish.

To give you an example: a year or so ago we had a complete revision of the mining rules and regulations. It took our departmental men two years to revise them. Some of the hon. members of this House sat on the committee to which I am going to refer. It was an enormous job, with Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Rickeby and Mr. McFarlane, collaborating with the best authorities they could get here and elsewhere, and they completely revised the mining regulations.

We then called in some of the hon. members, in a very formal committee, and we went through the rules and regulations, and while there were perhaps some slight changes -- as the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will recollect, --

after going over all of it, we decided it was the very last word. If we had been attempting, by a parliamentary committee, to do this work, it would have been endless, and probably would have arrived nowhere. That is why I suggest, having our present regulations, that if we can sit down together, probably in a day or two, we could arrive at some useful conclusions. At these meetings, any hon. member who is interested could attend, and go over them with those to the meeting. If there are regulations which could be strengthened, we would be delighted to have suggestions.

On the other hand, to have a parliamentary committee investigate this, in my opinion would really not produce anything. What we want is to keep our inspectors and their staffs, and personnel, on their toes all the time. That is one of the administrative matters which is going on all the time. I would say that these discussions here probably, if reported through the press, will do good, because it will create atmosphere.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not think so, from what appeared in the press last night.

MR. OLIVER: It does not break new ground, Mr. Chairman. It does not open any new avenues, which are not presently available to the hon. members of the House. There is nothing to hinder one or two or three hon. members of the House at any time going to the Department of Labour, and sitting down with their officials, and making suggestions, but it seems to me, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) that this matter is of such grave concern, that it calls for more than casual examination.

In the Province today -- at the moment -- and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) recognizes it -- there is very realy concern, as to whether the regulations for safety from fire are adequate under present-day conditions.

MR. FROST: Let me say to the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) that we have had experience with public halls, and we had an

investigation into the halls of this province, and in the end, after the whole thing was over, the Commissioner himself told me -- after they had arrived at a decision, after some two years of work -- that the investigation really disclosed nothing we did not already know. What was needed was the best integration we could get of our preventive services.

I can assure the hon. members of this, that when you take these present regulations which are the result of the experiences of years, you will find that it is the human element that causes these failures --

MR. SALSBERG: Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROST: And I would say if, by the pressure of our own people and by the pressure of people outside, you can improve the human element, you have the answer to it, and that is the only answer to it.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not the human element, when bars keep people from getting out.

MR. FROST: I told the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) I would call the resolution, but I wil not call it now. Surely it is not needed after all this debate on it.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) raised it, not I.

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not going to call the resolution --

MR. FROST: What is the use? We have debated it at length now.

MR. OLIVER: I will make this suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), if he is not going to call the resolution, that is all the more reason we enter into a discussion of what this resolution contains. It will be my purpose to discuss it at some length.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman --

MR. OLIVER: I am discussing this. Well, if the hon.

Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is going to walk out in an atmosphere of this kind, all right. But I am discussing this in a rational way, and I have not said one work that is out of the way.

MR. FROST: Could I make an explanation?

MR. OLIVER: Go on. I have let you make two explanations already.

MR. FROST: I say this is what happened. I discussed this matter with the two hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was good enough to see me about it, and I discussed it with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr.Salsberg), and I said I would mention it in the Estimates. I was very foolish to have done that, becaus all it has done is to waste the morning on this --

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say that nobody has spoken longer than the hon. Prime Minister himself (Mr. Frost).

MR. FROST: I said I would call the resolution, but surely it is not necessary to call it, after all this debate.

MR.OLIVER: I am not suggesting it is even necessary to call it, but if we are not going to call it, at a subsequent time, we perhaps should have some discussion on it at the moment.

I suggest there are two points. One of them is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) has suggested if we set up a committee of the House it would take some time to bring in its report; and the second thing is that the report would probably reveal there was nothing but what the Department already knows.

I will say this about it. In the first place, this matter is of such dimensions, particularly in the public minds,-- they are afraid of it;after the Noronic fire and after the Richmond fire, and after all these others, the public generally want to be assured that our regulations in regard to safety from fire hazards are the best we can possibly develop in this province.

I f a committee of this Legislature sits for three or four months, and they bring in a report that there is nothing new in it, then the public mind will have been satisfied, and our obligations and duties as legislators will have been discharged.

But I am not at all persuaded that some time should not be taken in this matter. It may well be that a committee, properly constituted, can bring into this Legislature some very worthwhile suggestions which might be incorporated into these regulations, which will have the result of bringing our Statutes and our regulations to a much nearer state of perfection than they are at the moment. I think that is a reasonable request, after all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the other point; I think in this House we must say -- and be quite frank about it -- that the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) suggestion is a casual one; it is one which can be taken up every few days. You can walk over to the office of the Department of Labour and talk with the officials, but that will not satisfy the public demand for a clarification of this question. That is the point. All we have to do as legislators is say to the public generally, "Even though our regulations were not up to date, the recommendations we make in this report will bring them up to date". Either that, or say to the public, "There is nothing more we can do with our regulations; we have to depend on the human element". Whatever we do say, after a thorough analysis of the situation, will, to my mind, put the public at ease, and to a far greater extent than they are at the present time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on this matter at all. I will be very brief, and I hope it will not be necessary for me to speak several times about it.

But I do want to put forward one or two very serious suggestions. Perhaps I should take as my text the reference of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in his first speech this morning, on the basis of "complacency", which always exists. It may not be here, but potentially it is always there.

Of course, complacency is not confined to the public service at all; it is found amongst industrialists and workers. But it is always there, -- it is even among hon. Ministers.

We have recently noticed an enquiry into the Workmen's Compensation Act, and its administration, conducted not by a member of the Ontario Public Service, but by a judge of the court of appeal. That inquiry was conducted, I assume, because the government believed the time was ripe that it should be undertaken, and not by one of its own experts in the Workmen's Compansation Board, but by a judge in the court of appeal.

When the government made that decision, I take it the government was recognizing once again something we all know, and that is a man who is on the job all his life does not always come up with ideas which an outsider would. Vincent Massey once referred to this point, when he said:

> "Under our system of government, we have learned the value of the amateur, and the contributions he can make, which are sometimes quite different than the contributions of the expert."

That is true. One of the functions of the hon. members of this House is to be amateurs, and to make the contributions which the experts are sometimes quite incapable of making.

Now, with regard to "complacency". I want to say to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that I was a little disturbed by an experience I very recently had with his Department. I have not said anything yet to him about it. I am saying what I have to say here and now, because I want it to be noticed. I do not want it to be written off with an acknowledgement, as

these things are very often done. I want it to be noted.

I want to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he should require his boiler inspection department to wake up in regard to its operations. I am not saying this for the purpose of criticism. I would like something done about it.

Quite recently, it was brought to my attention -- in a way which was quite unanswerable and unquestionable in view of the documents I saw -- that a large industrial plant in this province was not observing the regulations in respect to steam pressure. Now, I am strictly an amateur as far as steam pressure goes. I do not know anything more about it than the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) does. But I saw enough to satisfy me that the regulations were being deliberately and persistently broken.

Not only that, but it was perfectly plain that the company was doing exactly what your Department had refused them permission to do, because they applied for permission, and the Department turned them down. That was enough to satisfy me that there was something wrong.

I tried to call the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) but he was not available, and I spoke to one of the people in his Department, and I was surprized -- really surprized -- by the reception I got. Ordinarily a public servant is courteous and intelligent and co-operative with the hon. members of this House. I told him who I was; I gave him my name, and I said "I am not writing you a letter about this; it seems to me you ought to investigate it". He was unwilling to do it. He said he did not like to investigate unless charges were made in writing. I was not prepared to make any charges in writing, and there was no reason why I should. When an hon. member of this House tells an officer in a Department that in his opinion there should be an investigation, the Department should act immediately. There is no question about that.

This particular individual was not only indifferent, but uninterested, and discourteous, and refused to do anything about it until I threatened to take it up with the Minister. That, and that alone, brought a very reluctant consent to conduct an investigation. I was interested in the investigation.

He wrote a letter to the company stating the date he would come around and inspect it. Can you imagine the provincial police, if they receive information that a certain party is a large bootlegger, writing a letter to that bootlegger and telling him they were going to come in and investigate him? Can you imagine them writing a letter to him saying "I will call at your establishment on Tuesday, April 4th next; please govern yourself accordingly".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is precisely what was done in this case.

Some of the workers in the plant were quite annoyed about it, because they had to change the steam pressure; the maintenance men had to get busy and change the system, because "His Majesty" was coming. Then he found he had to change his plans, and was good enough to advise the company that he had to change them, and the poor maintenance men had to go all around the plant again and raise the steam pressure.

MR. DALEY: Will you give me some information on who that was. I do not want any discourtesy in the Department. I would like to check on that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am sure you do not. The reason I am mentioning it here is two-fold. I think perhaps the officials in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) department will hear about, and they may be a little more careful from now on, that I have mentioned it. In the second place, I want something to be done about it. I do not want the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to be "put on the spot". I do not want to have to s and here

a year or two from now and blast the hon. Minister (Mr Daley) because an explosion has taken place in a plant, because the steam was too high. I do not want that to happen.

The circumstances surrounding that, I understand, are these; the company was up against it. There was some work they had to get done in a certain way, and they didnot have the proper equipment, and they yielded to temptation, and boosted the steam pressure. Temptation of that kind is always with us. If you had a man who could go out and discuss these matters with them, and insist on them staying inside the regulations which are provided, you might be able to avert a great tragedy in your career.

I would like to avoid that.

There is one other point which amazed me in the conversation I had with this particular official. I was so amazed, I did not make the appropriate comment at the time. Perhaps I had better not make it now. He said, "Well, what we are doing must be satisfactory to the insurance companies, and if it is all right with the insurance companies, it is all right with me."

MR. DALEY: That was insured?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes. He may have thought that perfectly logical.

MR. DALEY: We do not inspect them if they are insured.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The logical answer to that would be, for you to close up your shop, and have the insurance companies do all these things necessary. If there was any truth in that, we might get rid of all our inspectors, and require these people to be insured, and let the insurance companies do the job.

I think the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) will see the point, and the importance of avoiding that kind of "complacency". That is what it looks like to me. I think you might describe it in stronger language.

MR. C. CALDER (London): This might be the appropriate time to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) as to what steps he is prepared to take to require standard qualifications for steam fitters, and the standards under which they work.

MR. DALEY: There has been a request for some years for compulsory certification of steam fitters. I have made quite a survey of it, and it is almost impractical.

In the city of Toronto, probably where some large firm would have a number of qualified steam fitters, they might be able to comply with the regulations, but to take a town or a city, even like London, St. Catharines, or Oshawa, where there is a plumbing and steam fitting organization, and they may have one or two steamfitters, and a number of plumbers, and when the steam pressure jobs come in, they are all in on it.

Now, to a large extent, a great deal of the work, as far as erecting a steam boiler is concerned, is the matter of cutting the pipes and fitting it, which is, to a large extent, plumbing. These men are all plumbers. Very nearly every boiler of any size or capacity is designed by blueprints, approved in the boiler inspection department of the Department of Labour, and come onto the job ready to put in. It did not seem to me to be practicable. I wrote individually to a great many of the smaller plumbers and steamfitters establishments throughout the province, and asked them, first, were they a member of an association which was making the respresentations to me for this thing, and I was assured in most cases that they were. Secondly I asked them did they approve of us putting in regulations which would prohibit any one but a qualified steamfitter doing any work on a pressure job? And in every instance, they said "no".

This might be all right for the city of Toronto, where they have these big establishments, but in other cases, from all the smaller municipalities, the answer was "no".

So I simply told the representatives of the steamfitters, that they had a job to do in their own organizations, to convince

their membership that this is what they wanted. I just do not think it is practicable to operate that as a province-wide scheme.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr.Chairman, following up this question, I was approached by plumbers and steamfitters in London when I was there, and they showed me the resolution of the city council, the builders' exchange, and the union, and all sorts of other groups interested in the proposition. They could not give me an answer to the question I asked them, but maybe the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) can. Has any province in Canada or State in the United States any regulations or laws such as they are requesting -- to your knowledge?

MR. DALEY: I cannot give you that answer now.

MR. J. I. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make one or two observations, and draw them to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley).

One is in regard to inspection, because in one division of his Department, the Workmen's Compensation Board -- for which I see nothing in the Estimates here -- they are following very closely the practice, that when an investigator is asked to come in and check up on a condition, or a claim, and investigate it locally, by a local union, they do, in almost every instance, contact representatives of the union, which is good policy.

But in the other divisions of your department, in the factory inspection branch and others, although the request is made by the union, they do not follow that practice. I think that is something which should be encouraged in all of the branches of your Department.

One other feature of the Labour Department is the question of conciliation, and although the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has covered the situation fairly well, we in Hamilton have had some pretty bitter experiences, in spite of the fact that you brought in a new Bill. I do not think that Bill will

meet the requirements.

The fact of the matter is in one particular case in Hamilton, at the Bonner Plant --

MR. DALEY: Next week we are going into the Labour Bill; can we not go into that question then? Can we not let these go through, and let me get these few dollars, so we can carry on?

MR. DOWLING: Right this morning, your conciliation officer is in Hamilton, meeting with that company. I believe that was only because we asked you personally, that he is there at all. Some of our experiences have been rather disappointing, as after a conciliation board has sat, it has been nine months before the report was finalized.

I want to say something regarding the appointment of the Chairman -- to give you one illustration. When a union representative, when there is a dispute, is appointed by its organization to represent the union, and the company appoints its representative, you have the final appointment of a chairman. The field from which you can appoint a chairman, I think is somewhat limited, and you generally appoint a judge. Sometimes they do not meet the requirements, and sometimes they do. Let me give you an example of one case where after the meeting, we find in the report:

> "The chairman recommends that there should be a wage increase of four cents per hour across the board, retroactive to the 1st of May" --

and this was signed on the last day of December, 1949. Then it goes on:

> "And there be a further increase of three cents an hour across the board, payable from the 3rd of November, provided that the union agrees to accept the recommendation of this Board, including the recommendation of the chairman with regard to wages,

"within two weeks of the filing of the report by this Board."

The union must accept it within two weeks, but there is nothing about when the company accept it. If we want to disagree, then we can go on strike.

You have another conciliation body in Hamilton this morning. I think your staff is not adequate enough. I know every one of them, and I have negotiated with them, and I say that your staff is not large enough, but the ones you have I think know more about industry than anybody else in the country. You have had more conciliation last year than ever before in the history of your Department. I feel your Department should increase its staff, if competent people can be found, but they cannot be found, unless you can give them an adequate salary.

MR. PARK: On the point of conciliation, I notice Item No.5 of Vote 96 is up to $50,000. Last year, I believe it was $20,000. In the Vote, you have added "commissioners". In regard to that difference, do you find that you under-estimated last year, or have you got it up two and one half times as much?

MR. DALEY: Yes, that is really it.

MR.PARK: You under-estimated it?

MR. DALEY: Yes.

MR. PARK: How much did you under-estimate the $11,000. for legal fees?

MR. DALEY: We did not spend all that.

MR. MacLEOD: Who is the lawyer for the Department? The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter)?

MR. PORTER: If he was, he would not accept any pay anyway.

MR. PARK: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) tell me in regard to Item 9, it is being spent for the various items

mentioned,"advertising, educational work, conferences, speakers, publicity, legal fees, administration of justice"? That is a point which I believe the accountancy experts will be concerned with, that is how these things are kept track of in the Department.

MR. DALEY: A lot of them we could leave out. We do not have any of it. We have it there, so if these things do happen, and we run into something, we have an account for it. It is just to keep the account open.

MR. PARK: $11,000. to keep the account open?

MR. DALEY: Yes, for all these things.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): You are not going to spend anything on Item 9, in Vote 96?

MR. DALEY: Oh, yes, we might spend the whole $11,000.

MR. MacLEOD: You cannot have "Joe"Sedgwick on your payroll.

MR. DALEY: We have in here an estimated $109,000., or $110,000. That is more than we had last year. We have money for these things, if we require to spend it.

MR. WISMER: I was going to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to give us an explanation of Item No. 8. It reads:

> "Insurance premiums; Departmental non-ownership policies, $300."

What does that mean?

Hon. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): What Vote are we on?

MR. WISMER: 96.

MR. KENNEDY: Are we through with everything up to that?

MR. MILLARD: That is the first one.

MR. SALSBERG: Everybody is not as lucky as you are, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy).

MR. PORTER: Lucky? It was skill. You do not know the half of it.

MR. DALEY: I will have to look that up.

MR. WISMER: I think it would be interesting to know. Ownership of what?

MR. DALEY: We will get that for you.

MR. WISMER: No. 14 in Vote 96. What is "warriors' day council"?

MR. DALEY: That is a grant we make.

MR. PARK: In connection with the Canadian National Exhibition?

MR. DALEY: Yes.

MR. WISMER: To whom?

MR. DALEY: Warriors' Day.

MR. WISMER: Who gets the money?

MR. PORTER: The warriors' day council.

MR. DALEY: We will get that for you. It is an organization.

MR. WISMER: We just would like to know how you are spending the money.

Vote 96 carried.

On Vote 97.

MR. DALEY: I am advised that the Warriors' Day council grant was not paid for the last two years. I guess there was no request for it.

MR. WISMER: Well, well, well. It is so easy to see you can put your finger on the sore spot.

MR. DALEY: What is "sore" about that? It is there, so if they need it, we can give it to them.

MR. WISMER: The taxpayers will, no doubt, be interested in that.

MR. DALEY: I do not see anything wrong with that.

MR. WISMER: We will explain it to you later.

MR. PARK: On Vote 99, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise two questions; one about the practice of the board in issuing

rulings which cannot be found in the regulations, issued under the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

I raised it last year, and I want to raise it again this year, and ask if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is prepared, since the rules are all subject to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, if the Cabinet cannot alter these nonsensical rules by the Labour Board, in computing holiday pay.

What that permits the employer to do is this; you take the earnings of a worker for the previous year, and you remove from those earnings what he might have been paid as vacation pay for statutory holidays. You take out the week he gets the vacation pay for, and he gets six days for statutory holidays and you reduce his earnings by at least two weeks, and you compute the two percent. on a 50-week basis, rather than on a 52-week basis. I do not think that was the intention of the Act, and I know it was not the intention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) when he moved the amendment, because he made it clear that these men were to be paid the two percent of the total earnings. Certainly the Income Tax Department regard the vacation pay as part of the total earnings. Last year I drew it to the hon. Minister's attention (Mr. Daley), because it was a ruling of the Labour Board. He and his colleagues cannot assume the responsibility, because it is only a Labour Board ruling. Their rulings are subject to review by the cabinet in council. What you are doing is this; employers are using that yardstick, and are actually chiselling the workers out of two or three days in their vacation pay -- and I use the word "chiselling" advisedly.

That is one question I want to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to deal with.

The second one is I want to find out what provision there is for these so-called seasonal employees, in terms of these vacation with pay stamps. It has been brought to my notice in

certain industries and particularly the criticism is heard in the racing industry, where employees of race-tracks have not been taken care of, and it has taken a great deal of effort on the part of one or two individuals to get their vacation with pay stamps put in their books. I want to know if any directive has been sent to such institutions as race-tracks? The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) might take it up with the new racing commissioner, as this is something where the racing commissioner might do something to improve the working conditions on the tracks.

They have evaded the Act by not putting vacation with pay stamps in the books of the workers employed on a temporary basis. Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) give me a reply to those two questions?

MR. DALEY: Every man has the right to require the vacation stamps being put in his book, if he has a book. It takes three months before he qualifies for his vacation pay, and it may be that the employees only work a week or two on a race-track, and would not qualify.

MR. PARK: Do they become new employees every year at each and every separate track? If so, they will never qualify for holidays.

MR. DALEY: If they do that, I know some individuals go to the tracks on their holidays. We have men right here who take their holidays, and go and work on the race-tracks.

MR. PARK: I am not worried about them.

MR. DALEY: I know. I cannot give a definite answer to a question of that kind.

Of course we can compute the holidays with pay. The other question I will have to take up with the Board and the executive council.

MR. PARK: I gave you notice of it a year ago, and I thought a year might be enough time for you and the Cabinet to

get around to getting together.

MR. DALEY: You are the only one who raises these points.

MR. MILLARD: He is raising them for all of us.

MR. DALEY: We have not had it brought to our attention before.

MR. PARK: The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is absolutely wrong. He is had streams of correspondence in regard to this computation of holiday pay from Hamilton, from the local union of the National Steel Corporation, where the company has taken advantage of this situation. There is one case I know of. There must be others. He has had a stream of correspondence. He is just ignoring the correspondence which comes to his desk.

MR. MILLARD: Mr.Chairman, I have the only report here which seems to be available at the moment.

(Take F-1 follows)

MR. MILLARD: This one and only report which seems available, I notice and the item that we now consider, number 97, that it covers a total of 2 3/4 pages. It seems to me that it should be much longer when we are dealing in amounts like $1 million for industrial employees in the province of Ontario,--that is almost one-third of our population,--and this 2 3/4 pages are devoted to that portion. There are a number of items there but for such a large affair, 2 3/4 pages is not very much. It does not give the people sufficient information.

Then there is the administration of the Hours of Work with Vacations with Pay Act, and the Minimum Wage Act. We have a number of reports, but I must say, to me this is a very sketchy report, and it is a report of civil servants prepared for people of the province.

I would ask if it would not be common sense if these requests for over-time -- and I would mention them particularly, in view of the unemployment situation -- and if unions are involved, I would like to know who they are. Why can we not have a list of these applications for over-time, and by whom they were made, and for what purpose, and we should have the names of the applicants and the decisions of the board.

The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has pointed out that there were 900 applications, and yet there are only two or three cases, and we have no details of what was done or when it was done, and we do not seem to know what is happening in the province, as far as industry is concerned. Were unions in on this? It might be that if the unions should check up one another to see if one union fell out of line and allowed over-time above the regular hours, rather than reducing the hours of work, and take on more employees. Here, we are dealing with the estimates for 1951, and we have the report only up to March 31st of 1949, and that is the

record for 1948. It seems to me that information should be available so that we can see the trend. This is not secret business; It is a business where employees and employers are making applications for extended hours in their industry, and with the unemployment situation as it is, it is of public concern that these trends should be known, and the report of the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) is very small indeed, compared with the importance of the subject it covers. I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) in this particular voate that a lot of this information should be made available.

The same thing is true regarding individual -- or I should say, industrial -- disputes, We have here a very sketchy review giving a detailed list of strikes and lock-outs, but it is very unsatisfactory. Why can we not get the results of these strike actions, and the kind of disputes, involved, whether they are industrial or concerned with the unions -- what were the prime factors of these disputes, and what was the final result? The information should be in this report. It deals with a very important part of our industrial life in this province, and I say to the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) that his report should be expanded. The information is available to him, and it should be in this report.

MR. DALEY: I am not opposed to that, I will give it consideration.

MR.W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): I see on page 97, section 4, p- I should say on vote 97, section 4 -- there is this item, "Bank Commissions: Charges for Sale and Cashing of Vacation Pay Stamps -- $85,000." I notice at the end of this chapter, "Capital Payments to be voted for Payment, etc., Industry and Labour Board, $6,000,000."

Do the banks charge $85,000. for handling $6,000,000.? That is 1½ per cent nearly.

MR. DALEY: That is the cost that we pay.

MR. TEMPLE: Are you satisfied to pay the banks 1½ per cent for this service?

MR. DALEY: Actually, the deal with the banks was originally made through the Treasury Department, and it cost 25¢ a book plus 1/8 of 1 per cent of stamps in the book.

MR. TEMPLE: You have to pay that money to the bank, and still we are the greatest customer of the bank?

MR. DALEY: The bank must audit the books and have the money and send the books to us, and on receipt of which, we send them their money eventually. There is a lot of work and effort in this job.

MR. TEMPLE: If I were the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) I would go to the Treasury Department and have that cut down. Outside of the Dominion of Canada, or the railway companies, I do not think there is a bigger customer for the banks than the province of Ontario. Why should we pay $85,000. to handle this $6,000,000.?

MR. DALEY: I hope that what you have said will have some effect on them.

vote 97 agreed to.

On vote 98.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): Let us get back to vote 97, on "Charges for Sale and Cashing of Vacation Pay Stamps" Were there any prosecutions last year under the Vacations with Pay Act, of employers refusing to abide by the Act?

MR. DALEY: I think there were two, I am not sure. I think there were two and a great many complaints were made, and we went after them to see that they complied with the Act.

MR. FELL: Did any involve race tracks in Ontario.

MR. DALEY: No, I do not think so.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): I have here correspondence exchanged with the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) that was turned over to the Department of Labour, with respect to vacations with pay, and a claim made by a young lady that she was entitled to added vacation pay. She was not given it, and the nature of the inspection by the board was pretty well covered; it says:

"We are in receipt of a signed statement from the company which claims you received one week's vaction with pay"

and it goes on to say:

"In view of this statement --"

and so on.

The woman knows that the statement was inaccurate, and yet the board gave her this information. There was obviously no inspection but just an acceptance of the statement by the company. She only received the letter,

"We are in recei t of a signed statement --"

and the letter goes on:

"In view of this statement, we have ruled --"

There was no investigation whatever. It would seem that the board merely writes to a company, and they get a letter back saying that"We are obeying the law", and then the board writes to the applicant and says, "You have no right". That is the way the board is acting, and I think the title of that board is clearly a misnomer.

On vote 99.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): In the review from this department in the last public accounts which we have available, under "Boiler Inspection", there are"fees, inspections, $49,000.; fees on inspection of uninsured boilers, 18,000."

I understand that the only boiler they do inspect are the uninsured boilers; is that right?

MR. DALEY: We inspect the boiler where the boiler is made and then it is put into the place where it is to be operated, and is again inspected. Then it is insured by the insurance companies, and we are relieved of the cost from there on.

MR. DENNISON: You depend from there on, on the insurance company's inspection?

MR. DALEY: After the final inspection.

MR. DENNISON: How do you get a fee of $49,000. from ordinary boiler inspection, and a fee of $18,000. from inspection of uninsured boilers?

MR. DALEY: They were inspected before the insurance company took them over,

MR. DENNISON: You put the fee for the examination for people who take out their first, second and third and fourth papers, and so on. You get a fee of about $34,000. a year, which is approximately half of the fee from the boiler inspection, and I was wondering if more of that revenue could be raised from boiler inspections, and perhaps less from the examination fees. I would like to express that opinion, that it would be more proper, and a fairer proposition, to raise more or your revenue from the boiler inspections.

MR. DALEY: I will give it some thought.

MR. DENNISON: Another thing; the salaries in this department of boiler inspection are increased from $67,000. to $83,000. There were 26 employees listed in the public accounts on page 24. It seems to me that the factory inspection branch is in danger. The explosion of a boiler which took place in Brampton was carefully studied, and in certain

situations it might mean the death of a great many people, and I question very much whether, with 26 employes at a salary of $83,000., the department can do the proper job, and as the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) said, some of these boilers are inspected by the insurance company. I think that this is one branch of the department that the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) should keep on its toes, because there is nothing more dangerous than a boiler explosion, and it would be a tragedy to have anything left undone in the department that could be done to assure safety.

MR. DALEY: I appreciate that, and I can say this: that we could use a couple of boiler inspectors right now, if you know men who are well qualified. We could use them. It is a very stiff test and they have to be very competent men.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Do you pay well?

MR. DALEY: We pay reasonably well now.

Votes 99 and 100 agreed to.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Just a moment. On Vote 100, item 4, there is the item there, "Building Trades Protection Act, $50.00"; what is that?

MR. DALEY: It is an old Act, and practically inoperative.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): This is the branch that inspects building plans. I would like to know whether the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) will insist on the performance of the duty of that branch in connection with the United States consulate building that is being constructed on University Avenue? The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) should see that the department does its duty, in view of the position of the American officials, when they believe they can put up

buildings without inspection or revealing their plans, and I was wondering whether this department will stand up for its rights, and insist on an examination of the plans of the new consulate building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a factory.

MR. SALSBERG: It is connected with the item before us.

MR. DALEY: We will certainly look into that. They will bring in their plans.

MR. SALSBERG: They did not bring them to the city of Toronto, and the city planned not to give a permit. I was wondering whether you would insist on your rights and do the job. What is the answer? It is the right of the department to insist.

MR. DALEY: Yes, I will say, "Yes".

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): We have had a lot of discussion about factory inspection, and it is amazing, in view of what has been said, from this side of the House, and said by thehon. minister (Mr. Daley) last night, that they are going to try to expand. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) spoke of his interest, and yet the factory inspection branch has a lower estimate than last year, and the estimate is lower in salaries for permanent employees. It is lower by $9,350. I should say that now it is $8,280. for permanent salaries. That must mean a curtailment. Is there a cut in wages?

MR. DALEY: There is no curtailment or cut in wages.

MR. PARK: Five people share $8,280.

MR. DALEY: I think there has been a transfer from one department.

MR. Your composite is down too, and that is an old gag, transferring. Why do not you make your arguments, too. They are both down on salaries.

MR. DALEY: Now I have the answer here for the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg); the answer is that the plans for the American consulate have already been examined.

MR. PARK: That has gone into a sinking fund; the surplus you had last year is gone. The Treasury tells us of the surplus, and that included the other amount. Where is that money, -- in a hole?

You told us last night that you were going to expand in three departments, and the foreign inspection, composite inspection, and minimum wage is down, and yet you are going to expand.

MR. DALEY: We have funds to do that; we have hundreds and tens of thousands more this year than last year.

MR. PARK: You use $30,000. of them for this extra conciliation board, you have increased some of the other departments slightly, but the three vital branches are all down. We think that we should have some explanation further on that.

Vote 100 agreed to.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): When complaints are received from employees regarding the hazards that exist in a factory, and the inspector makes an investigation, it is customary for him to consult with the man who made the complaint, or the union officials, before a report is made.

MR. DALEY: There would be no objection. But, in practice, we cannot follow-up a suggestion that every time an inspector goes into a plant he should hunt up someone who represents a union.

MR. PARK: Could not the union representative be sent a duplicate copy of the letter?

MR. DALEY: We do not write letters to employers when inspectors are coming down. That is all nonsense. The whole problem of Ontario is zoned, and there is an inspector

for each zone, and he goes from place to place. He might go here today, and there might be some recommendations to be made, and he says that it has to be corrected, and then he might come back in two weeks' time and drop in to see whether or not any progress was made. He cannot stop to look for union people.

MR. PARK: Would it not be a good thing to deal with the unions?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): The complaint comes through the men and they should be consulted, and I think that with a spirit of co-operation, we could them there, and if the complaint comes from a man, then the man should be consulted.

MR. DALEY: I cannot issue instructions that every inspector should hunt up the union officials; he has many jobs to do, and they take up with the department any definite complaint. I could not possibly follow up your suggestion in practice, that the inspector should meet the representatives of a union every time he goes into a plant.

Votes 101 to 103 inclusive, agreed to.

MR. PARK: What about that big reduction?

MR. DALEY: We have the money to do all that is required to do, in addition to expanding our services.

MR. TEMPLE: The hon. minister (Mr. Daley) says he has all the money . Do you mean to say that you can transfer the money you got under vote 96 over to vote 100, to cover that?

MR. DALEY: No.

MR. TEMPLE: How will you find it?

MR. DALEY: We can get money from the Treasury, if the circumstances warrant it.

MR.DENNISON: There has been a lot of that.

Votes 104 and 105 agreed to.

The Committee recessed at 1:10 p. m.

- - - - - - -

The Committee resumed at 2.00 o'clock, p. m.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, may I revert back to the Labour Department.

MR. FROST: No.

MR. HOUCK: It is rather important.

MR. FROST: If we go back there, we will be there all afternoon.

MR. HOUCK: I do not want to take up the time of the House, if you do not want me to ask a question.

MR. FROST: Well, go ahead.

MR. HOUCK: This is something which the hon. minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will be interested in, as the chairman of the Parks' Commission at Niagara Falls, in which he is very vitally interested. I noticed in the press of yesterday, they discovered nine deer on Navy Island, which is under the control of the Parks' Commission, and they claim, according to the report, that shotgun shells were found around these deer, and that quiteaa few of the deer had been cut up, and the meat taken away. I asked the game overseer about it, and he said he counted over 100 deer. I think it is the policy of the Parks' Commission to make that sort of a game preserve, and they are doing a good job, but owing to the position of the island, the policing is difficult, and I know the chairman (Mr. Daley) will do everything he can to see that the wild life is protected. I know that most of the damage comes from the other side, but not from the Canadian side, although these shotgun shells were said to be a Canadian shell.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I have not received a report of that as yet, but we do set aside that island as a game preserve, and we do everything we can to see that the game remains unharmed. It is true that Americans do come over

and you say these shells were Canadian shells, so those people must have come from Canada. We will do everything we can to stop this.

MR. FROST: Vote 37, Department of Education.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Now, I proposed a much longer speech will be required of me than I had intended to make.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): No, just make it good.

MR. PORTER: Oh yes, I always do that. And I am always rather short.

Mr. Chairman, before entering into a discussion of the estimates of this department, there are just one or two points I might mention. This, of course, is a department which in most of its branches of activities has been carrying on from year to year, according to generally accepted rules and principles, and in many aspects of its work, there is very little change from year to year.

On the other hand, in the last few years there have been in some branches of the work of the department some very great changes.

I would like to remind the hon. members of the House that during the last year we have seen an extension of the period of expansion which has been under way in this province since the end of the war. In the elementary schools, for instance, in 1948 - 1949, there were 579,252 pupils, and in the last year, for 1950, enrolled now are 598,971 pupils, an increase of 19,721 in the elementary schools.

In the secondary schools there have been an increase from 124,068 to 127,068, an increase of 3,000. So that the total enrolment in all elementary and secondary schools of the province has increased by 22,721 pupils.

That, of course, indicates the importance of many of the activites which have been undertaken by the department with reference to the supervision of the building of new schools, a matter which has been mentioned on a number of occasions in this House previously.

The program of school building throughout the province has proceeded at a pace just as rapid as it did the year before, and there appears at the present time to be no indication of any slackening in the pace of building school buildings.

The number of teachers we have teaching in the schools throughout the province has also increased, perhaps not by as large a number as might be ideal, to handle the growing number of pupils, but, nevertheless, there has been some increase in the number of teachers.

In 1948 - 1949 there were 24,514 teachers; last year, 1949 - 1950 there were 25,331, making an increase of 817. That gives, in a very bald way, perhaps, some inkling of the magnitude of the problem of education in the elementary and secondary schools in this province.

We are engaged in the task of what really amounts to mass education, the education of every child in the elementary school years, and the increasing number of children in the secondary schools. Some 25,000 teachers are doing that job. There have been, in the last year, a couple of changes which I would like to mention.

There has been a change in the formula for school grants. This is a matter which has been under constant attention of the Department ever since we entered into the program of school grants in 1945. The grants in the past have been computed on the approved costs of the different school baords, and of course the grants have been made on a scale of per-

centages, with the intention generally, to spread the provincial money applied to school grants, so that the places which needed the money most would get proportionately a larger share of the money raised by provincial sources of taxation.

It was found that in the working of the grant scheme, as it applied, a number of inequities developed. I do not know whether there is any for la which can be devised by man, which would be a perfect formula, no what we did.

But there were certain inequities which developed, and we have been endeavouring for some months -- or more than months, -- to find a formula which would improve the situation. The formula which is being applied this year, I think is familiar now in its outline to the hon. members of the House who are interested in it.

The announcement was made at an earlier part of this Session and distribution was made of the total on the grant formula which now applies. I think, on the whole, it meets the situation of the school boards in the province in a more equitable way than the former formula, that has existed before, and which has been introduced into the scheme of grants, a per-pupil grant.

The principle upon which the new formula is based is that there will be a per-pupil grant all the way across the boardoof $59 per pupil, and in addition to that there is a percentage paid on a sliding scale of the teachers' salaries, and debenture payments which might have to be met. It was found in a number of cases where schools have been forced to undertake new building projects, in the way of new of new school buildings, that in many cases under the former grant system, they were not getting a proportionate increase

in grants, as a result of that. Now, if they undertake a new building, they get a percentage of the debentures payments which have to be met on the new building and also there will be paid a percentage of transportation costs, when there is a system of transportation in rural areas particularly where that is being done on quite a large scale. The whole scheme of grants has been improved in other respects, and perhaps except for minor details, the different scales of grants have been worked out more gradually, and there is a less abrupt difference between the percentages paid, for instance, as between urban municipalities of one population, and the next population branch. There did seem to be abrupt changes which took place in some cities which went from perhaps 10,000 up to 12,000 and they found themselves suddenly in quite a substantial lower percentage bracket. Now that falls more gradual and there is a much more even scale.

The other thing I would like to mention is that during the past year certain curriculum changes have been announced, of quite-far-reaching effect. These changes , I think, on the whole have commended themselves to people interested in education throughout the province. No doubt there are differences of opinion about some features of them, but the main objective of these curriculum changes may be put in this way; to provide a broad, flexible curriculum which would be designed to fit the needs of the great variety of pupils, rather than to have an inflexible curriculum for all types of boys and girls throughout the province, making it necessary for them to fit themselves to something that is rigid and unbending. Of course, there was never anything which can be said to be even approaching perfection in the matter of curriculum. There has to be some uniformity, but we thought

we should allow for the greatest possible flexibility. Every child has slightly different needs, as to the curriculum approach. It is impossible in any public system of education to have something special for each individual, but where some flexibility is allowed, and where the children of brighter minds are allowed to progress a little more rapidly and not be held back by the rest of the form -- where those who perhaps are of slower mentality are not being whipped forward too fast in order to keep up with some of the brighter pupils.

Those are matters which should be taken into consideration when working out a curriculum of this kind, and we felt that changes are in the right direction in that respect.

I may observe that the total amount of money appropriated for grants to boards of education, elementary and secondary school boards, has been increased from $37,500,000 to $42 million, and in university education, increases have also been provided for.

University grants in the last year -- 1949 - 1950 estimates -- were $3,957,000.; the estimates this year will be $4,647,000.

It is interesting to note that in university enrolment, taking our several great universities in toto, the university students in Ontario number 27,520.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a very large enrolment in universities. Let us compare it, for instance with the universities in Great Britain. They have in Great Britain an estimated population, in England, Scotland, and Wales, of 46,700,000 people, and they have a university enrolment of students in those counties of 67,608. That is one student per 691 of population. In Ontario, the ratio of university students to total population is 1 to 156 of population.

Mr. Chairman, the great problem in this province is not to open the gates to more people for our universities; one of the great problems is to keep our eyes on the target, as to the purpose of university education, and constantly consider whether we are not overdoing it; are we not trying to do the impossible, to give higher education to more people than can absorb it, or for whom we can provide adequate staff, and adequate facilities. Higher education is quite a different thing from elementary or secondary school education. Unless it is done right, it might better not be done at all. It cannot be done in a half-baked way. It is possible in the elementary schools that even a third-rate teacher might do a fair job in teaching the necessary fundamentals of education, but for higher education, something more than that is required, and mass higher education is a contradiction in term. Our great problem must always be to consideraasking ourselves this question from year to year, "Are we going too fast in trying to educate too many people, in view of the facilities now at our disposal and in view of the capacity of these people to absorb the education which is provided?"

As a result of that, are we not trying to defeat our real purpose in providing first-rate higher education in this province?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there are any other special matters to emphasize at the moment. No doubt there will be a number of questions which will be raised during the next few moments, and I will leave the matter stand for the moment.

On vote 37.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, there are, as the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) has indicated, several matters

which I would like to discuss at the opening of this first item, number 37. And the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) will appreciate my re-introducing a question which was neglected the last time I had the opportunity of discussing these matters in the House. I refer to the rep rt of the Royal Commission on Education. I am sorry --

MR. PORTER: Could we not deal with that when we come to the item?

MR. MILLARD: It is right in the very beginning of the estimate. It is under number 37.

MR. PORTER: I would very much prefer to stick to the program as in the estimates.

MR. MILLARD: You have been following, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) that policy, and I think it is a matter under vote 37, item 13.

In the course of my previous remarks, I made the statement which you questioned very seriously about some remarks you made last year in regard to the Royal Commission on Education, and the matter of its report.

(Page AA-9 follows)

so I would like to read from last year's Hansard, page 770, two remarks, one of mine, and another by the hon. minister of Education (Mr. Porter). I said:

> "Mr. Speaker, cannot the ministry or the cabinet in a matter so important proceed now and not wait until we get the part of the reports which are finished, but let us deal with the recommendations contained therein with respect to these matters? Why do we have to wait for the completed articles."

The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) replied, again according to Hansard:

> "We don't want the hit-and-run half-baked business."

If I, in the course of my remarks, used this term "half-baked", which the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) uses previously with regard to another matter, I hope I will not be considered as bringing the debate down to a low level. The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) introduced that term himself. He continues:

> "We want to know the whole picture. That is the only advantage of a commission-- "

He says the only advantage of a commission is to know the whole story.

Now, as has been pointed out previously, in the speech from the throne, this year it is suggested-- in fact, it is stated that:

> "Sound and careful standards in elementary and secondary education, coupled with constantly improved teaching manners provide the foundation

for a vigorous and a healthy people. The Royal Commission on education has made an interim report for consideration and study, and further reports are expected this year."

In other words, we are to get what you termed last year "half-baked reports" from the Royal Commission on education. We are going to get them in installments from here on out.

I would like also to draw the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) to the fact that last year when we were considering estimates, page 1157 in Hansard, the minister stated:

> "but as to what the commission is doing or is going to do, and what the decision is going to be, and what there recommendations are going to be, we do not know, and I am sure none of the staff know."

And yet this year, as I have indicated, we are all told that the Royal Commission is, in fact, going to deal with the questions piece-meal, and we are going to get some interim report, on the question of the matters before the commission.

As was pointed out by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) in the introduction to his estimates, we already find that certain changes are being made, and then immediately those changes in curriculum are announced before we have an interim report from the Royal Commission, dealing with a part of one phase of its terms of reference, namely, "teachers' supply".

In that regard, according to the report itself, and the daily press, there is to be a relaxation of the question of qualifications for teachers, a matter which is considered in the Speech from the Throne to be vital.

MR. PORTER: That is what the report recommended. It does not say that is what it is to be. If you want an answer to that question, I will answer it, and stop you from speculating, because nobody said there was going to be any relaxation in the standards of teachers at all. All the report did was to recommend a certain thing. That was all.

MR. MILLARD: I am dealing with your Royal Commission's report.

MR. PORTER: You are putting it as if there was to be something.

MR. MILLARD: I will say to the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) if he will be try to be calm, I will try and be calm too and we will get along faster.

MR. PORTER: I will not have a lot of misstatements put on the record.

MR. MILLARD: This Royal Commission has been functioning now for five years--

MR. SALSBERG; And ten days.

MR. MacLEOD: Are you overlooking the fact that the report was presented on Tuesday night.

MR. PORTER: I ducked that one.

MR. MILLARD; It seems to me that we should not be requested to go on with this estimate and make appropriations and pass the estimate for a commission which is obviously

off the track, because the work it started to do-- and which was referred to it-- is now being ignorred by the government.

MR. PORTER: Not at all.

MR. MILLARD: The government is proceeding--

MR. PORTER: That is not a true statement.

MR. MILLARD: The government is proceeding, as was announced partly in the press, and was so stated in this House in the hon. minister's (Mr. Porter) speech in debate, according to the Ontario government news, to make very important changes both as regards the organization and as regards the elimination of examination, and as regards teachers' supplies, and as regards a number of important matters, including the whole question of financing, the construction and maintenance of schools in this country.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: Then you are proceeding now without the benefit of the report of the Royal Commission, by which you said the only advantage was to have the entire matter before you. You are proceeding now without the Royal Commission.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: You have abandoned the Royal Commission's recommendations on these matters. I do not think this House, Mr. Chairman, should be asked to continue to just vote this money in the dark for these purposes, when it is quite obvious that, in the case of the curriculum changes, to which the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) has again referred today, the Commission was totally ignorred. At least the Committee on curriculum was totally ignorred.

MR. PORTER: What committee.

MR. MILLARD: The committee of the Department and the men working on the whole question of curriculum.

MR. PORTER: What committee on curriculum? That is an entirely new proposal to me. What committee on curriculum does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) refer to.

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. minister of Education (Mr. Porter) new what was going on in his Department and in the Commission, as well as knowing what his subordinates know--

MR. PORTER: What committee was it?

MR. MILLARD: A curriculum committee of the Royal Commission, in which a number officials of your Department were participating.

MR. PORTER: Tell me who they were. Tell me something about it. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) seems to have a great mine of information about this. I would like to know. I would very much like to be enlightened, and I would like some facts, not just a lot of allusions to it.

MR. MILLARD: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) deny there was such a committee.

MR. PORTER: I do not know anything about any committee, nor any departmental officials.

MR. MILLARD: I suggest that you discuss it with the Director of Education, and he will put you wise as to what is going on in your Department.

MR. PORTER: If they have a committee on the Commission, I do not know what it is.

MR. MILLARD; There was a committee of the Commission -

I should refer to the chief director. There was no official of the Department participated in the Royal Commission committee-- none whatever. There were several officials who were called as witnesses before the Commission's own committee, but none of the officials of the Department were sitting with such a committee, or participating in the deliberations of such a committee. They merely gave them the benefit of their views in the witness box, in answering the questions they were asked.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I say something about the Royal Commission on Education, and may I give the position of this government-- and, indeed, I am quite satisfied any government--which might be relevant to this.

I do not think, myself, there is any misunderstanding on the part of the people of the province. There may be some intellectual help needed by some of the hon. members opposite, in regard to their own minds. I would like to give the position of the government in connection with this Commission.

This Commission was appointed five years ago, with very wide references, to inquire into all matters relating to education. I think the terms of the Commission were very much broader than anybody anticipated. Certainly I think the members of the Commission themselves did not anticipate it.

The Commission itself is a very representative body of citizens. I see here Mr. M. A. Campbell, who is a life member of the Ontario Educational Association, and I may say a very staunch Liberal, and the hon. leader of the Liberals (Mr.

Oliver) and his group know that he is a very fine gentleman. I do not hold his political affiliations against him. He is a very able man and has a great and abiding interest in the future.

Page "AA-16" follows.

We have Mr. A. Vance Chaplin, a member of the Board of Education of Port Arthur, and a very well known gentleman from the head of the Lakes, and very much interested in education. We have Mr. Conquergood, a member of the Toronto Board of Education, and a man extremely well thought of.

MR. MILLARD: You would not say he was a Liberal?

MR. FROST: No. Then there is Mr. Edward Fawcett Henderson, a very able educationalist in this city, one who has a tremendous following, and who has given a great deal of endeavour to this question in Ontario. We have Mrs. Ruth S. Houck, the wife of the brother of the hon. member from Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), a woman of very great ability, and one who has given untiringly of her time and ability to the cause of education. To show that the matter is entirely non-political, I believe she is also vice-president of the Ontario Liberal Association. However, I do not hold that against her. I think it is only good citizenship for people to take an interest in political parties. This commission is entirely non-political.

Then we have Mr. Arthur Kelley. I do not need to tell the residents of this city who Mr. Kelley is.

We have Mr. Norman McLeod, with whom I have had a great deal to do-- incidentally, he is no relative of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). He has been the chairman of the secondary teachers federation. Mr. McLeod is a very wellknown educationalist in this province.

We have Mr. Ralph Neelands of Kirkland Lake, whose activities in education are wellknown.

We have Mr. Joseph Tate, Mr. Loftus Reid who has

been chairman of the Board, and has been interested in education for years. We have Mr. Henri St. Jacques, from Ottawa. The hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) can tell you more of Mr. St. Jacques' great accomplishments.

Then Miss Helen Sheppard, president of the Ontario Women's Federation. We have Doctor Smith, the president of Toronto University, Dr. Townsend, a prominent clergyman and educationalist in this province. That is the commission.

Mr. Chairman, this commission has made a very thorough inquiry into the subject of education in all its phases. I have discussed this with some of the members of the commission, and they tell me that getting into their work-- and I do not think it is any secret on my part to say this; I have discussed the matter with a number of their members, including the relative of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck)-- and non of them anticipated the breadth and depth of this very great question and the matters involved in it.

I would say this, as government policy-- you can take it this is government policy, and always will be the government policy in matters of this sort; we realize the magnitude of the task of this commission. They have been given a free hand, carte blanche to go ahead and look into all these matters. We have not in any way attempted to influence their decision. We have told them we would be interested, of course, and we would hope their report would be made soon, but we have not in any way tried to use this commission other than to get them to give us their own judgment and opinions on the great matters with which they are dealing.

I may say, if you were to go back to Dr. Ryerson's time, a hundred odd years ago, you will find the Ryerson investigation into education took years before he was able to present his report, and before he was able to get any part of it adopted by the legislature of those days.

Ryerson himself said, in his last days, that it would take generations to carry out the ideas he had in the matter of education.

That is the position we take in regard to this commission. We are hopeful that the commission's report may be brought to completion, and that it may be broad and comprehensive and complete report, and that it will give for generations to come a chart for the course to be followed, the same as with Mr. Ryerson's famous report of one hundred years ago. We hope that will be the case.

But I want to make this plain, that this government is not abdicating to any commission; we are not abdicating our responsibility and right of government to any commission. I will say that what will be done arising out of the report when it is received, depends entirely upon what this government does, or what some other government which may be in office at that times does. We in no way say that what we do will be bound in any way by the report. We do not say to this House we will adopt any part of the report; we do not say to the House we will not adopt it all, or that we will adopt a part of it. It depends upon how we feel, as the people who are responsible to the electors, and the people of this province, what will be done, with this report, when it is received.

This commission was appointed in 1945-- about five years ago, now. At that time the school grants in this province amounted to around $8,000,000-- the total expenditures for education in this province ran to about $18,000,000. Today we are spending over $42,000,000 in grants, and we are asking for an appropriation for that much and are spending over $56,000,000 this year in connection with the total cost of education.

The whole picture has been changed. The circumstances surrounding the curriculum have altered and changed in that time. We have been constructing school at an unprecedented rate, across this province, and I think the people of Ontario can say that we have made more advancement in education in Ontario in the last five years, than in any comparable period prior to that, and I think I am safe in saying that we are in the lead of any jurisdiction in all America.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We are spending about twenty-five cents of every tax dollar on education. I am satisfied of this, that it is not the efforts of the government; it is the question of what our people want us to do. I think in the last five years we have spent over $200,000,000 in education. We are hopeful of our continued efforts to advance the cause of education. It may be, with an operation so great, there will be many things in which there should be changes, and we may find there should be changes to be made in the future.

It is a good thing to have a commission of good,

intelligent citizens to study this great question, to see if we have made any mistakes.

TAKE "BB" FOLLOWS.

It is a great thing to have a Commission of good experienced citizens, there have been some mistakes and there could be alterations. The Commission can see and the people of Ontario can see the problems with which the Commission is faced. Don't think for one minute we will stand still and wait for the report of this Commission, that was not ever intended and is not intended now. Do not let the members of this House think we will be bound on the whole or in any part by the Commission's report, we are looking forward and we know that the Commission is doing a great job and we have the greatest confidence in the Minister of Education.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): We are going ahead with these things and will do a good job and if the Commission on education can see any better ways that could be employed and for that matter any member of this House-- we are prepared to consider them. That is the situation as regards the situation on education. I have discussed this with the Chairman and the Chairman himself has emphasized in their findings that they never asked for nor has there been offered any government interference of any kind. They wish to feel free to give a report for what it is worth to the people of Ontario and if it is in part acceptable they will be pleased no doubt. In the meantime, as long as we are in the treasury benches and from the result of the by-elections I would say it would be for some time, we will govern the people and take the full responsibility in our eyes.

D. H. MILLARD (York West): I might say in reply

to the prime minister (Mr. Frost) that he has a most convenient Commission that ever was appointed and when it was appointed by his predecessor we felt that the reason they could not carry out the promises made in the now much talked about...

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): If that was the case then, it is not the case now.

MR. MILLARD: The reason you could not proceed then was because you did not have the confidence, and now the reason that you must proceed is because you had to go ahead without having confidence.

HON. DANA PORTER(Attorney-General): We know the facts.

MR. MILLARD: It works out which ever way you say and I don't blame you to maintain a Commission that is so convenient to your political needs at the moment. It is not very much for our educational problem.

HON. H.M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is a gratuitous remark in view of the fact that the members of the Committee are all good citizens.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Let us have one subject at a time. We have listened to him a dozen times today.

MR. MILLARD: At the time the Minister of Education, the part-time Minister of Education...

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Don't rub it in.

MR. MILLARD: On Saturday November 5th after you made a speech at St. Thomas, according to the Globe and Mail,

there was this editorial, a leading editorial, headed "Back Into the Forefront":

> "The changes in curriculum and school organization announced by Education Minister Porter will do much to put Ontario back into the forefront of educational progress... "

HON. DANA PORTER: Do you not agree with that statement you just read.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: Why do you interrupt when the hon. member is speaking.

HON. DANA PORTER: He is quoting something.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: If this sort of thing is going to continue the ministers will not be allowed to speak without being interrupted themselves. The member from West York is entitled to the same courtesy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: If the ministers were confident as they pretend to be it would not be necessary for all these interruptions.

HON. DANA PORTER: I merely asked whether he agreed with the statement read to the House.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: From now on we will ask the questions that we want.

Page "BB-4" follows.

MR. MILLARD: I would be pleased to answer the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if he would give me the opportunity.

MR. PORTER: I am delighted.

MR. MILLARD: My answer is that these nebulous announcements that you made regarding curriculum in organization, and that they will apply if you are trying to take us from the backwoods of education, and put us in the forefront, may providence help us, because you are not.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: I am glad that I am getting some applause from the Opposition benehces.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) has the floor.

MR. PORTER: I wanted to ask a question, but the hon. member (Mr. Millard) will not answer anything. He chooses the usual evasion. Apparently he is not competent to make any statements.

MR. MILLARD: I will not deal with the question of competency with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter); it is odious.

MR. PORTER: That is not as bad as the statement you made about me.

MR. MILLARD: I was going to point out that the statements made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) have been anything but assuring; they could be called a "wild leap in the dark", and certainly we are "in the dark", and it seems to me from the first announcement at St. Thomas and later announcements in Toronto, that there is a great deal of uncertainty as to these curriculum changes. I want to say that I consider it was an evasion, and a callous disregard of responsibility on the part of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), and to the question I asked of this House on the Order Paper of February 20th, and I would

like to reiterate that question for the record.

"Enquiry of the Ministry. 1. What were the amounts of the general legislative grants paid in 1949 for public schools in: (a) Toronto (b) Forest Hill Village; (c) Long Branch; (d) Scarborough Township. 2. What would the grant have been in each case if the grant plan outlined in the Minister's memorandum to secretaries of Boards of Trustees, dated February 17th, 1950, had been in effect."

You take the same set of facts and apply last year's regulations and the amount received, and then you apply the same set of facts to this year's. Why did I not get an answer? I got a rather laconic answer, and I think it was rather ridiculous. I got the answer that it was a hypothetical question, and no information is to be given on this fact.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: I submit that it was anything but a hypothetical question.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: There goes Charlie McCarthy.

MR. MILLARD: Any child could answer that question, and any member of your staff could answer that question. All you had to do in each case in the school boards mentioned is to take the amount they were given last year and find out the answer on the same set of facts under the new regulations, and I am sure that is not a hypothetical question, and if it is a hypothetical question, that hypothetical question is being asked all over the province.

School boards want to know the answer to that question.

MR. PORTER: We have not the information about these items in 1949, we have no information subsequent to 1948.

MR. MILLARD: And you do not know what grants you paid out last year?

MR. PORTER: We paid out under 1948 costs.

MR. MILLARD: That is basely what the question was.

MR. PORTER: How can we answer it without the information.

MR. MILLARD: What the cost of last year...

MR. PORTER: Grants are not made out on the 1948 information so why get into hypothetical possibilities of that kind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How are you going to compute the grants, -- you don't answer.

MR. MILLARD: If it is not possible to answer the question I have asked, I would like to ask the minister how does he arrive at this new estimate of grants and why does he think that it is more equitable than before, and there is no question on behalf of the school boards that are hard pressed and there are many complaints regarding this question now.

Page "BB-7" follows.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to read that editorial that I had commenced:

BACK INTO THE FOREFRONT

The changes in curriculum and school organization announced by Education Minister Porter will do much to put Ontario back into the forefront of educattional progress. The vast prestige once enjoyed by the school system established in this Province by Dr. Egerton Ryerson has in recent times been slipping away. From being the world leader we were in this field, we have become old-fashioned, even in our own country. Educational authorities have been hoping for some action in this direction for a long time. To suggest that the Government's proposals are "a wild leap in the dark," as an uninformed political critic has already termed them, is ridiculous. To some extent they have already been tested in this country, and much of the general approach and basic philosophy are to be found in the new British educational system.

The arbitrary division of the educational process into two distinct parts has been an increasingly serious handicap to teaching. The four divisions of the new scheme will overlap the break between elementary and secondary education, the only noticeable distinction in the new method of education being related to the biological change in the pupil, from child to adolescent. This has a practical advantage also, as it permits a course of study which may be brought to an end at sixteen, the legal school-leaving age. Under the old scheme, many students have been leaving in the middle of their secondary school course, without either a mark of achieve-

ment, or a completed program of education.

This new method of organizing the schools has eliminated finally the old "entrance" examination, one of the landmarks of the Ontario public school system. For some years it has not been a departmental examination, and only a small proportion of the pupils now try it. It should not be assumed, however, that the abolition of the entrance eliminates tests from the schools altogether. There may even be more of them, much better adapted to rate objectively the progress and weaknesses of the pupils than the highly artificial and overvalued barrier they replace.

The merging of the grades into divisions has immense potential advantages for the pupils, but these could be seriously injured by poor teaching or lack of congeniality between teacher and pupil. If one teacher is likely to have an individual pupil through three years of school life, difficulties might grow far more acute than in one year. In large schools that might not be a permanent problem, but not all schools would have several classrooms with the same grade-division. It would appear that an important result of the change in the system will be a distinct raising of teaching qualifications, which in recent years have been badly diluted in the name of expediency. With the right sort of teacher, there is much to be gained, however, by allowing the child release from direct attention all day long, as well as in being able to suit the pace of his learning to his own capacity.

Another very important advantage in the plan is the liberation of the curriculum from the rigid regimentation which has characterized the Ontario system almost from the beginning. There are dangers in too much freedom, of course, but there is no suggestion that this will occur. Due to pioneer conditions, it was necessary to uphold strict standards of uniformity in the early days, to ensure adequate teaching and the elimination of inferior schools. The present public school system is no longer on trial with the people, and general agreement on standards has long since been accepted. A far greater degree of variation to suit local conditions, both economic, and social, will be possible under the revised curriculum. Good teachers and bright pupils will no longer be forced to remain in the strait-jacket of departmental regulations.

There could be no such fundamental change without difficulties, known and unforeseen. We have no doubt that the Government will face them with the same boldness and courage with which it has decided to take action to modernize these phases of the system. There are many other factors which will have to be considered, and Mr. Porter has provided the time for careful reflection. For the present, those who have devoted lifetimes to the study, of education greet the reforms with enthusiasm. The public may accept their judgment with confidence."

There are many complaints regarding this question.

MR. PORTER: Where do these complaints come from? I do not know what the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is talking about.

MR. MILLARD: If you will not interrupt, I will tell you.

MR. PORTER: You have been asking questions, and you do not want to get an answer to them. Let us get on with the estimates. I am always reasonable.

MR. MILLARD: We did have a similar discussion here today.

MR. PORTER: There are no hard feelings.

MR. MILLARD: My heart is loaded with sympathy for you, if nothing else.

MR. PORTER: I did not notice it at the time.

MR. MILLARD: You have before you a letter addressed to you, on March 14th, from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Urban Schools Assocaition, and presumably they presented to you a plea entitled, "New Grant Structure", and there is one question I would like to ask.

MR. PORTER: They did not supply me with any plea. I would have thought that the people who want to know about education would come to the source of supply. The trouble is, possibly, that they would be persuaded, if they came to see me.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to tell you of the letter.

MR. PORTER: I have the letter, but no brief.

MR. MILLARD: The paper gave you the benefit of some of the things in the brief.

MR. PORTER: You can take the responsibility on that, you can say whatever you like.

MR. MILLARD: Does the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) agree with the statement therein: "Complete regulations will be issued in due course"? We have that in your letter.

MR. PORTER: I have no recollection of what the exact words were, in a letter some weeks or months ago.

MR. MILLARD: I think I have said enough to show that this is an impossible situation, and if the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) does not know what is going on in his own department, there is nothing more that I can say.

MR. PORTER: That is an entirely unfair suggestion. I was asked to remember whether I had said certain words, and I could not recall what words were used. Now the hon. member (Mr. Millard) suggests that I do not know what is going on in my department.

AN hon. MEMBER: Do you?

MR. PORTER: I certainly do.

I have that information here now, "Complete regulations will be issued in due course". What is the matter with that?

MR. MILLARD: Do you see nothing wrong with it?

MR. PORTER: No. What is all this circumlocution about?

MR. MILLARD: The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) has put his finger on the point I wanted to emphasize. You have an announcement by the department that the whole grant structure will be changed, and we find that we are dumping into the educational pool some $4½ million, and we do not know whether it will be equitable, or whether it will impose a hardship on some, and benefit others, whether it will benefit separate schools or public schools, or collegiates, and there is a drastic change in the grant. It is announced to the press that there will be more money paid, and that is supposed to fix everything. The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) did not take the position, as last year, when they changed the fire and the police. He says, "Your grant is going to be reduced, but

we will put $4½ million to a new grant structure. But have no fear. You are going to get as much as last year. You have not tested your grant system. You annnounce here a grant system and you give a figure on that, and then you say in your memorandum to the school boards, "A complete set of regulations will be issued in due course".

How can boards and municipal councils proceed on a "hit and miss , half-baked" system of grants. Is it to be released where release is needed? The association of urbsn schools trustees have not only appealed to the government but they interviewed the government, and I would like to know before we are finished with thes estimates why we cannot have the facts in this legislation in regard to these important matters. What is going to be done in the different municipalities, and can they depend upon anything. In regard to this grant business, I find in a document which came to my attention a most round-about approach to this problem, and it is by officials of your department. I will submit the names to the hon. Minister (Mr.Porter) later, if he so wishes. Here is a report by a deputation that came to Toronto not very long ago, but I will not take the time of the House to do that now.

They were trying to give some assurance to the school boards in question. And it was said all grants would be paid on items even if they are not included in the new regulations. What does that mean? Does it mean if a deputation comes to to your department and sees officials of your department, that they will not be hurt, regardless of the new regulations, and that they will get a dispensation that will take care of their requirements? I have never seen such a f ible set of regulations in my life, that can be twisted to meet the con-

venience of everyone, provided the circumstances meet the approval of the government.

MR. PORTER: Do you want an answer or not? If there is any suggestion that I am interested in, I would prefer not to be criticized. Do you want an answer?

MR. MILLARD: Certainly.

MR. PORTER: At the request of the hon. member (Mr. Millard) I will answer his question. If the hon. member (Mr. Millard) would look at the general Legislature grants circular that was sent out in paragraph 1, subsection (b) 3; it says:

> "Approved Capital Outlay from current funds, except that in the case of a board in an urban municiaplity with a population of 2500 or more and a board in a rural municipality with a population of 20,000 or more, the amount eligible for grants shall not be more than that which would have been eligible under the former regulations."

That related to the former regulations.

MR. MILLARD: That is as clear as mud.

MR. PORTER: I cannot help you on that.

MR. MILLARD: It has to be realized that this grant system and its ap lication is far from satisfactory, and it is even a little bit more uncertain than the one previous, and that is the system we have now.

It was pointed out in the document received from the Urban Schools' Trustees Association, and it should be brought to the attention of the hon. members of this House, it is pointed out in the case of two boards used as examples to illustrate the way the regulations apply, that the board, having a total expenditure of something like $2 million for instructional purposes, they get a grant in the neighbourhood

of a $23,000. increase. $2. million expenditure for instructional purposes, and they get that figure of $23,000.

Another school board having an instructional cost of $190,000. have got an increase of $37,000. under the new system. I am not saying that we are entitled to more consideration than we got before, but I do say, surely no one can justify the present grant system as being fair and equitable, and we have to have more information as to how it applies, and have answers to our question.

I want to say a word about teacher supply, and a word or two about federal aid for education costs, that seems to me also significant on the question of teacher supply. We have heard from the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) regarding the purposes of higher education and the fact that it is not a mass education proposition, and should be reserved to those who have the facility and the capacity. Is that not a rather dangerous approach to the question, and likely to cause a great deal of discrimination? I would like to read from an article in the Globe and Mail of the issue of March 6th, in which the well-known reporter, Mr. MacTaggart said:

> "During the past year, the National Conference of Canadian Universities has made representations to the federal government which outline the critical stage of university finances and suggest that federal intervention is both logical and essential."

I hope the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) will accept this in the spirit, because I believe these representations are important, and might possibly be taken up with Ottawa in the near future. And I would like to read a part of one paragraph of that newspaper article:

"Most important of all, they stress education should be within the reach of all whereas today university statistics show a drying-up of the flow of young, gifted students from rural and village homes. These younger people just can't afford higher education. Fees have gone too high; living costs prevent them moving to university centres. The obvious result is a loss to the nation of potentially skilled scientists, doctors, engineers, artists and so on."

That is the result of an educational conference by the universities themselves.

(Take CC follows)

And they note a very important trend, that the supply of students which has in the past been recruited from the farms and villages of this country is drying up, because of economic reasons, and the high cost of higher education. So I would ask the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) to give very careful consideration to that point.

In regard to the question of teachers supply. I do not know -- the government has not stated its position fully on the question of recommendations of the Hope Commission's report in regard to that matter, but the fact is that in spite of the assurances given us today by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) that the teacher supply situation is not bad, the fact is it is in a critical condition at the moment, -- a very critical condition, and in my opinion, and apparently in the opinion of the Royla Commission, the steps that are necessary to correct that situation are not being taken by this government. That spells a problem -- a critical problem --

MR. PORTER: Will the hon. member (Mr. Millard) support the recommendation of the Commission on that point?

MR. MILLARD: No, I will not support it, and the teachers' association is also opposed to it.

MR. PORTER: Have you anything to suggest?

MR. MILLARD: Yes, I have plenty. Are you going to offer the necessary inducements for qualified students to go into the teaching profession? Are you, in fact, going to make it a profession; are you going to make these people technical people -- technicians of education -- so that they will have the necessary standing and foundation and qualities, and give them the necessary remuneration for their training and their efforts? You certainly have not announced any steps to be taken to do away with the large number of

permit teachers you have now, and certainly the population of your normal scholls does not give room for any optimism, particularly in your announced changes in organization, because if you are going to reduce the number of pupils in the junior and intermediate sections, so that a classroom is scaled down from 40 to 45 pupils in the urban schools, now, to 30, then it follows you will require more teachers rather than less, for our school population. And you will require more schools, and that is a point I am coming to in a moment.

MR. PORTER: That cannot be done overnight.

MR. MILLARD: No one expects these things to be done overnight, but you are not taking steps now to prepare for the natural increase, to say nothing of these changes in organization and curriculum.

Then I want to say a word regarding the school construction, and on this point I might say I am gravely concerned. The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) announces in this document which I have already indicated to the House, the "Ontario News", that experiments in these new curricula have been going on for some time -- quietly, in various sections. But I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) what has the department done to repare the school boards for these changes in the kinds of school construction? They have gone on building purely elementary schools, with class rooms to accommodate 40 or more. Now you come along and say it will not make any difference to the school construction program; in fact, the school construction program as was announced here today with a great deal of pride, is one of which boards and municipal councils have been given no warning, that these changes were going to take place, and the architest's department ofyour department of Education, has made no move in

that direction whatsoever, but they are still going on approving plans for schools, on the old elementary and secondary school basis.

MR. PORTER: That is right, and they still will. There is no suggestion there is to be any change there.

MR. MILLARD: If you continue having to build buildings at high costs, with rooms to accomodate 40 or 45 pupils, and then when the new organization comes into effect, you will only have 30, I do not think that is sound economics.

MR. PORTER: The building cannot go on as fast as that. There is no danger there. That is just your distorted viewpoint.

MR. MILLARD: You are proceeding now in a "half-baked" way. The ingredients may be good, but they are only "half-baked".

MR. PORTER: I would have been happy to know from the hon. member (Mr. Millard) what would be a better way? What would he have recommended?

MR. MILLARD: It seems to me after waiting for five years, and having appointed the very respectable citizens, and giving them time to study --

MR. PORTER: In other words, the hon. member (Mr. Millard) ould recommend waiting longer for the Commission's report?

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): No, just ask for it.

MR. MILLARD: I would have them produce it.

MR. PORTER: How can they produce it, if it is not complete?

MR. MILLARD: If it is not, how can you tell us we are going to get the report now?

MR. PORTER: That is what we are told.

MR. MILLARD: Who told you?

MR. PORTER: As the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost).

MR.J. I. DOWLING (Hamilton East): "Passing the buck" eh?

MR. MILLARD: What I am saying here is that they have taken too long --

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard)has not recommended anything constructive, so far.

MR. MILLARD: May I make a recommendation now?

MR. PORTER: Yes, I will be delighted to have you.

MR. MILLARD: It is this: we have had presented to this House a voluminous and very comprehensive report on conservation, and I noticed in the section which deals with education, in that report, that one of the main items is their recommendation that there shall from here on out, be a comprehensive educational program in our schools. That means trained teachers, and an enlightened student body.

MR. PORTER: That is right, and we are starting that.

MR. MILLARD: But when we get the Committee's report, the printing, I note is limited to all hon. members, that they would secure a copy of this printed report, and certainly there were not enough copies there to provide for the educational text books, the whole picture to be presented to the teachers, and a certain amount to introduce this very important educational need into our school curriculum, and into our school system.

What I am suggesting now is that you should add to that printing request at least a number of thousands of copies, necessary to put into our normal schools, and into our other schools, to give out to our school boards, and so forth,

to get our teachers ready, in order that they can start carrying out the program. I think the time has arrived, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) -- if you will pardon me for a moment -- when we have to teach the children of Ontario that it is just as much a felony , just as much a crime, to go out and steal our natural resources, to destroy our natural resources, and destroy the future heritage of the people of this country, as it is to steal a dollar, or a cent or a lead pencil, or anything else.

MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that the matter has been under discussion with the chairman of this Committee on Conservation, and officials of the department, for the preparation of copies suitable for the schools, but it does not come under that item of expenditure.

What is the hon. member (Mr. Millard) recommending? He said he was going to tell us how we could solve this problem in a better way than we have done. I do not know what the conservation report has to do with this. That is only one phase of the whole question with which we are dealing. We are dealing with the question of the whole curriculum. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) criticizes us, but has nothing to suggest in line with a better way.

MR. MILLARD: In the conservation report I think it is pointed out by the committee that one of the necessary steps is to acquaint the public mind -- to prepare out future citizens, and provide them with the necessary background, material and knowledge of a serious situation, so that steps can be taken in order that public opinion may be able to face up with this serious situation.

MR. PORTER: That is being done.

MR. MILLARD: I notice that already there has been not sufficient copies prepared for the wide distribution, required.

MR. PORTER: Reports for school use may have to be revised somewhat, and put in a somewhat different form.

MR. MILLARD: There are one or two other matters--

MR. PORTER: Is that all the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has to recommend.

MR. MILLARD: If ybu will just wait--

MR. PORTER: I hope they are more far-reaching than those we have so far.

MR. MILLARD: I want to repeat the recommendation I made last year, and I would be happier in making the recommendation, if the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) would pay more attention to it.

MR. PORTER: I always pay attention to everything that is said.

MR. MILLARD: My recommendation is that you give up the ghost, and that we get a full-time Minister of Education.

MR. PORTER: That is a substantial suggestion. What would he do, when he got in there? That is where you are very weak. You cannot help us much. You do not know what better policy can be persued than has been persued up to the present time.

MR. MILLARD: I can assure the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) that a minister with the necessary ability could find plenty to do.

MR. PORTER: I admit that part about "ability". I am too modest to do otherwise, but that is the only suggestion that the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has to make, that is, to get a minister with greater ability, who will devote his full time to the work. Or have you anything else to suggest?

MR. MILLARD: That would be an important start.

MR. PORTER: That is not a recommendation. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) has nothing--

MR. MILLARD: Do you want me to tell you?

MR. PORTER: No.

MR. MILLARD: No?

MR. PORTER: No. I want you to tell us what we should do. What would be the proper policy.

MR. MILLARD: I think one thing he should do is to devote his whole time to this very important Department.

MR. PORTER: That is about the weakest answer I have been able to get yet.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to point out to the members of the House, in case you have forgotten it, that this is an important department; it is a tremendously important department of government, and has not had a full-time minister now since 1943.

MR. PORTER: We have not done too badly. We apparently have carried out our policies so that you cannot suggest anything that would have been better.

MR. MILLARD: According to the Globe and Mail, you have slipped to the for-front--

MR. PORTER: We came to the fore-front with a part-time minister.

MR. MILLARD: And with a half-baked program.

MR. PORTER: We came to the for-front, with a half-time minister.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The trouble with the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) is that he confuses garrulity with argument.

MR. PORTER; When you are on half-time, you have to make up for it.

MR. MILLARD: This is a serious question. Last year I asked the hon. minister for the grants given to all the public and separate school boards in the province of Ontario, for 1947 and 1948. Now, a few months ago, after considerable prodding, I was given copies of that information, and I now have them in my possession.

MR. PORTER: Have you found them very useful at all.

MR. MILLARD; It is of little use.

MR. PORTER: I suppose it is of no use, because the grant system is changed, and you are out of luck.

MR. SALSBERG: Was that why you gave them to him?

MR. DENNISON: It means a difference of $600,000 to Toronto.

MR. PORTER: I am not weeping tears about Toronto. But I do not want the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) to come back and say to us that we are taking undue time on these estimates, because half the time has been taken up on that side of the House.

MR. JULIAN: The hon. minister (Mr. Porter) cannot criticise him for taking up too much time. I would say, on the contrary, he is taking up too much time himself.

MR. MILLARD: I am suggesting the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) is taking up too much time and saying very little.

I find here in the report which was only submitted to us yesterday, -- and it is for 1948 -- of very little use, regarding the teachers supply situation, for example, has this to say, that it was a matter of concern as far back as when this report was written. Despite the improvement in salaries which has taken place --

MR. PORTER: It has been a matter of concern, I guess, for about 100 years.

MR. MILLARD: I am not complaining, Mr. Chairman, but there is no use trying to make a point with the hon. minister (Mr. Porter). He wants to make suggestions, but he interrupts every time you try to make one.

MR. PORTER: I beg your pardon. I am sorry. I guess I am too enthusiastic.

MR. MILLARD: I say that the hon. members of this House are entitled to a more up-to-date record of a situation so important to the people of this province. To get a report less than 48 hours before the estimates are introduced here, is just not good enough. This report does not contain very vital information. There is no reason, if you are going to go to the expense of getting out a report of this type dealing with an important matter, why you cannot put in a record of the grants which were made. Why do we have to get them separately? Why do you put them in for secondary schools, and not for the separate schools and public schools? Last year, we were told there was nothing to hide. If that is so, put in the information, because this book, when we try to make comparisons, is of little or no value. I get this book, but here again the vital information required is absent. It is not there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by asking three or four questions, and I would like the hon. minister (Mr.

Porter) to make a note of these questions, and if in the course of his estimates, he would be good enough to give us the answers to them, I will appreciate it. I think they are all fair questions; they all bear on officials of the department under his direction, and I would like to know:

(1) Were any teachers, teachers' associations, school trustees, school boards or boards of education consulted regarding the new curriculum before it was announced by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) on November 3rd, and if so, who and when?

That is vital to the people concerned, teachers and so on. Were they consulted?

(2) What, specifically, has the Department of Education done to advise teachers and school boards in detail as to what is involved in the new curriculum?

That is an addition to the very general outline contained in the hon. minister's (Mr. Porter) original announcement on November 3rd, and subsequent press statements.

(3) How many pupils were required to try examinations in the school year year 1948 - 1949, and how many were granted entrance standing without examination?

In regard to that, Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) if he will, to make a further statement as to how it is expected that this system of appeals to inspectors is going to work. I am speaking now of the school teachers in the rural schools, who are not going to have the benefit of the usual rights by way of a departmental examination paper for high school entrance. They are in neighbourhoods amongst friends and neighbours; how are they going to set the examination or the test, and decide when a pupil is qualified to leave, the fourth grade, or the eighth grade

and pass into another grade? I would like more information, because it seems to me that is a very grave problem.

I know it is the intention of the department to try and stop this sharp break, but in the case of separate schools you have made the announcement that there will be no change in separate-school set-up, so there will be a break between the separate schools and the high schools --

MR. PORTER: There is a break between the public schools and the high schools at grade eight. That will continue. This is grouping the grades for curriculum purposes only. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Millard) but I will deal with that at the proper time.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) if the idea is to stop this break between the public schools and the separate schools, and the secondary schools and the high schools? You put in the system that is intermediate, and covers two grades in public and two grades in high schools, yet you are not making any difference in the two schools, but are simply juggling the curriculum at this point. That does not stop the breaks.

(4) Is it true that under the new system pupils will pass from one division to another without examination, or the traditional methods of assessing attainments? If so, what steps will be taken under the new system to assure that attainment, rather than mere timing will be a major objective. I mean how do you measure your element of attainment?

(5) What will happen to the pupils in the primary division, who afterthree years are found to be advanced in some subject, but retarded in others? Will they be held back for another year, or passed willy-nilly on into another grade? I would like to know what the out-come will be, where you have

a pupil who is advanced in some subjects, but retarded in others.

(6) In the statement of November 3rd, the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) said that the courses of study which were prepared and issued by the department will be in general terms, and the responsibility for filling in the details of the various courses will rest at a local level, and it is anticipated that this will be accomplished through the wide participation for degree studies by groups of teachers and inspectors in co-operation with other competent persons, selected by local authority.

I would like to ask in this connection, when there is a disagreement among these persons who will finally determine the actual course, in any locality?

(7) What will be the effect of the system on separate schools? This is a problem raised in connection with the expected intermediary division, which will cover grades 7 to 10, and will the separate school instruction be extended to grade 10, or get back to grade 6, and will it be extended in some cases, and get back in others? I would like to have that information.

(8) In the past number of years, a large number of new schools have been contructed in the province, with the traditional elementary-high school system in mind. Obviously they will be suitable only in part if the new system proposed by the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) is put into effect.

That system has been for the construction of class rooms of 40 or more pupils. If that is so, why did the department not give some warning to the school boards engaged in the construction of schools so that their new schools would not be out of date almost as soon as they were built.

In the statement of Novebmer 3rd, the hon. minister

(Mr. Porter) suggested that the change in the system would reduce the pupils in a class from 40 or 45 down to 30. Obviously, to reduce the size of the classes to 25 or 30 will make it necessary to increase greatly the amount of class room space, perhaps by 50 per cent.

Now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) I want to seriously suggest that these are not frivolous questions. These are questions concerning school boards, and municipal councils, and they have come to me from responsible cources, teachers' organizations, and such like. I have, myself, drawn these questions in the hope that the government will now, through an announcement by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) make a clear-cut statement on these vital points, because the teachers want to know, the public wants to know, the small school boards and the municipal councils want to know, what the set-up is going to be.

I will conclude by moving an amendment,

> "Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Jolliffe, that item 13, of vote 37, 'Royal Commission on Education, $50,000.' be reduced to one dollar."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I beg to inform the House that this being the 31st of March, it is necessary to have the administrator , representing his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, come to the House and assent to certain Bills. He will be here at 4.30, so we only have three-quarters of an hour.

Apparently the hon. members opposite have no intention of letting the education estimates through today, so we will have to do the best we can.

Next week, we will continue the Budget debate on Monday, and then the Labour Bill, and following that

we will have to take the rest of the estimates. It is obvious we cannot sit tonight, or we could go through and clear things up, but the Chief Justice has to be here at 4.30, and then we will adjourn.

Next week there are also certain other private bills, which we would like to clear from the Order Paper.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I do not think thehon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should speculate about the intention of the Opposition in regard to the Department of Education estimates. For my own part, there are a few things I would like to say, and what I have to say, as far as I am concerned, will only take some 5 to 8 minutes. What others have to say, I do not know, but I do not think it is quite fair to speculate about intentions.

I should add that, of course, this is not all a matter within the control of the Opposition hon. members. A great deal has been said this afternoon from the other side, as well as from this side.

If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) thinks there is any planning or strategy on the part of this group to delay the passage of these estimates, today, he is quite wrong.

MR. FROST: Most of this morning's discussions were simply repetitions of what is being repeated on the outside. If that is the feeling on the part of the Opposition, I want to accommodate them in every way possible.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With great respect, I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should say that. Let us analyze this. Most of the discussion this morning was about safety standards, and about inspections, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said that could be discussed on Tuesday, in connection with the Labour Bill. It has nothing to do with the Labour Bill which comes up on Tuesday. I do not think that suggestion is justified.

(TAKE DD FOLLOWS)

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Suppose we get ahead as much as we can because we only have forty minutes left. Obviously we cannot finish up today.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: I have one word to say with regard to the Commission on education. I was not surprised that the Commission took one or two years on its work but when it becomes three years to four years and even five years the hon. prime minister will agree that any interested person will wonder whether the report will ever come in and how much value can be put on a document so long delayed. The hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) has referred to the fact that some eminent citizens are on that Commission, we all know that. I do not know what the government has seen fit to do in getting this report, it is difficult and we know that but the impression is going to be that this Commission cannot get out this report and there is going to be continued delay then there cannot be much value in the thing at all. It is costing the taxpayers money and the only report it has produced so far is one that I, personally, see no merit in, it looks so school-boyish. I am wondering if it has not reached the point that government should say we have to have a report of your conclusions, perhaps incomplete, but without further delay.

TAKE "EE" FOLLOWS.

There has got to be a line drawn somewhere. This cannot go on forever.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I want to take only a moment on this question. I think my views are well known in regard to this Commission, to its activities and to the desire that it should terminate its work and present the report to this Legislature. We have had the Commissioner himself speaking over two years ago, saying the report was just about ready. We had the former hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) saying at each succeeding Session he expected that at the next Session the report would be completed. They have been on this thing more than five years. What they did the first one, two and three years is, by this time, obsolete; it is of no use at all under the present set-up, and my hon. friend, the Minister (Mr. Porter) knows that.

I say -- and this is my last word on it, Mr. Chairman -- that to me the whole situation relating to this Commission and its inability to report is becoming a farce in this province, and the sooner we straighten it out, the better, and ask that they bring a report in so we may see what they have got in it.

MR. FROST: Has my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) his questions there?

MR. PORTER: I will do my best to answer this roster of questions. If I cannot answer all these questions fully on the spur of the moment, I hope the hon. member (Mr. Millard) will not say it is because I am on part-time.

MR. MILLARD: I will be glad whatever answer you give. Go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Thank you. Number one, the question as to whether teacher or teachers' associations and other bodies have been consulted with reference to the curriculum. The Ontario Teachers' Federation have a committee that has been active on

educational policy and matters of curriculum, and consultations have been held with their committee over a period of time prior to these curriculum changes coming out. As the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is no doubt aware, the Ontario Teachers' Federation is an organization set up under a statute, and is the official body representing the teaching profession, representing all the other bodies of teachers who carry on throughout the province.

In the second place, also answering this question, there is a research committee of the School Inspectors' Association, which has worked on the question of curriculum over a long period, and which has also been consulted from time to time prior to the announcement of the curriculum changes.

In the third place, a large number of school trustees, in their individual capacity -- there has never been any formal approach to school boards in this connection -- and superintendents of schools in the larger cities have also been consulted from time to time; and of course in some of our larger cities experiments have been carried out with many of the teachers, for instance, up in Forest Hill Village I understand they have carried on experiments many years especially with respect to primary grades. That has been done in a number of other schools in different places in the province, and there have also been some experiments in co-ordination of the grades in the intermediate division, which the hon. member (Mr. Millard) spoke of, in some of the schools in the province.

There was never any complete draft of any curriculum changes submitted to the various bodies in any formal way. These various committees have been working very closely, as I have said, with the Department, and it is well known that certain changes along these lines were under contemplation, and have been for a long time, and I need only refer to the statement I made the other day in speaking on the Throne Debate, when I read the

statement I put on record in Hansard a year ago, which indicated that then we were contemplating curriculum changes, and those changes would be brought forward and announced just as soon as they were ready. I cannot remember the exact words, but there is nothing particularly new in the introduction of curriculum changes of this kind. The matter has been under contemplation and discussion very widely in educational circles for a long time.

I would also like to point out with reference to the Royal Commission that I do not know that it is quite right for hon. members opposite to say to the government that it is for us either to defend the Royal Commission or to dispense with it. The Royal Commission was set up to act as an independent commission, not to do what it is told to do by the government from day to day, and I have honoured that arrangement. As I said a year ago when this question came up, I have honoured that arrangement, and I still do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But for how long? How long does your patience stand?

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, I have so much greater patience than hon. members opposite, that I am trying to be reasonable about this thing. I think the hon. members are being discourteous in the extreme to a group of people who have spent the amount of time they have spent and are still spending time --

MR. MILLARD: We will not have to go to them and apologize to them, like some people do.

MR. PORTER: Who apologized to anybody for anything?

MR. MILLARD: Were there no apologies offered to the Royal Commission?

MR. PORTER: None. Apologies to whom? What does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) refer to? The hon. member (Mr. Millard) has insinuated something.

MR. MILLARD: The discourtesy the government showed by making the announcement on curriculum.

MR. PORTER: What discourtesy to what commission? What has that to do with any government announcement on change in curriculum? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Millard) suggest the government is under any responsibility when it decides to take a course of action in education to ask permission of a Royal Commission before it can do that? Does the hon. member (Mr. Millard) suggest that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) a question?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes, certainly. But the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has not answered my question. I do not imagine he will.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) raised this point -- he referred to "discourtesy". Now, speaking of discourtesy, is the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) in a position to cite a single precedent in the history of the British Commonwealth of Nations where a Minister of the Crown announced important, sweeping changes on a subject matter which was at the time under consideration by a Royal Commission?

MR. FROST: Yes I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) an example that happened right here, and my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) said not a word about it. It occurred in connection with the Commission investigation Workmen's Compensation; there were broad matters submitted to the Commissioner investigating that subject, and while the Commission was sitting, we made broad changes relative to the treatment of nurses and others employed in hospitals, and brought them under it. Now, that might have been treated, as my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) says, as an affront to the Commission. Why, that is just one example. We have done countless things while this

commission has been sitting, and I will say to my hon. friends that we intend to go ahead and govern this country, and to run it regardless of any Commission, and regardless of what a Commission's findings may be, or anything of the sort. We do hope the Commission's findings will be helpful to the people of this province, and helpful to people of this and other days, days to come, but I can say to my hon. friends, that we have not the slightest intention of abdicating our right to rule.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Quite right, I agree.

MR. FROST: And I think my hon. friends will quite agree with that situation.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I entirely agree.

MR. FROST: Now, that is the situation, and if tomorrow something comes up that we think requires action, we will take it regardless of the Commission, and it is not an affront at all, in any way, shape, or form.

It is very curious indeed that my hon. friends opposite should talk about an "affront" when they go around the country talking about the "hopeless commission". They talk about the "hopeless commission"; that gem of wisdom has fallen from the lips of the hon. Member for West York (Mr. Millard) on countless occasions, it is a stock in trade, and he is the man who now says that we are affronting the Commission.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He did not appoint the Commission.

MR. FROST: They will drop from his lips until the people of this province are sick and tired of both the gem and himself. That could happen.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: And he is the man who talks about "affronting".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: I would like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to find one place where I made that statement.

MR. FROST: Well, you said it dozens of times.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Name one.

MR. MILLARD: Name one.

MR. FROST: If it is not in the newspapers, it is because they would not bother to print what my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is in the newspaper editorial.

MR. FROST: All right, but my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) started it.

AN hon. MEMBER: Oh, no, he did not.

MR. FROST: Now, my hon. friends talk about affronting the Commission; my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) piously wrings his hands and talks about affronting the commission, and here he sits down and draws a resolution to fire the Commission, to affront them by cutting down the Estimates to one dollar, in other words for the government of this province and the people of this province to say to these citizens who are very widely representative of the people of the province of Ontario, to say to these good citizens who have done this work: "Here's your hat, get out of here". Now that is the way my --

MR. MILLARD: They do not want to be pensioned.

MR. FROST: That is the way my hon. friends opposite talk about "affronting the Commission." I say, Mr. Chairman, there is no combination of people in the history of this province who have impeded the cause of education more and have insulted the people that have to do with it more, and have hurt the feelings of the Commission, have done everything possible to undermine the Commission, than my hon. friends who sit right there on the Opposition benches.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: If my hon. friends opposite had the ability to be ashamed, I would say their consciences are such they could not be ashamed of anything, but if they had the ability to be ashamed, if they could, if there was any touch of conscience left in them, they would walk out of here with their heads hanging.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): You are silly.

MR. FROST: They would be that ashamed for the way they have treated these good members of the Commission.

MR. MILLARD: You are the only man who has walked out of here today.

MR. FROST: And I want to say to my hon. friend for West York (Mr. Millard), he walks around in a very smug way, he is the only person, he and the little group around him are the only group in Ontario who really are perfect. They are perfect. When they walk around this province they are perfect.

MR. PORTER: They are full-time perfect.

MR. FROST: They are full-time perfect people; the rest of us in this province, we are just ordinary sinners, but they are perfect.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Extraordinary.

MR. FROST: They are too perfect for anything.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: And the people who sit over here in the Liberal benches, they are just sinners like the rest of us.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The Labour Progressives, the people who sit in the Labour Progressive section --

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): We are not sinners.

MR. FROST: They are worse than us, because they run a little opposition to them, but they themselves are the most perfect people that ever did walk upon this earth. If anything ever happened that is perfect, they are symbolic of it, and I would say I do not think there is a combination where you have got more hypocrites in one set than those people there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR.FROST: ... To have the effrontery to stand up here and say that this government, that is doing more for education than any government in the history of this province -- and I say that and my hon. friends cannot deny it;-- I say it, and they will have to like it because it is true; and the people of this province know it is true, they know we are doing a remarkable job for the people of this province in education, in spite of those people over there -- in spite of those people -- and I am satisfied that when the people of Ontario have their opportunity of disclosing their views, they will "toss" a lot of you people out. I am satisfied of that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: And, furthermore, I would like to say this.

AN hon. MEMBER: All the wings are not on that side.

MR. FROST: I want to say this to my hon. friends opposite that they have the effrontery to get up there, with all the halos they chalk around their heads -- no one would put it around their heads but themselves -- they put a little halo around their heads and they stand up and say: "We think your government did an awful thing. You affronted the Commission on Education, because you brought in a measure" -- which was accorded applause by the great majority of educationists of the province of Ontario--

MISS MACPHAIL: Last century.

MR. FROST: -- as a sound, proper move, and then they say "It is an affront", because you did that. You want to affront this Commission by asking the people of Ontario to hand them their hats and coats and firing them out the door and make an appropriation of one dollar. That is just the type of reasoning we get from hon. members over there. I must say I never listened to so much hypocrisy packed into one hour as I listened to this afternoon from the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHALLIES: No check-off.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr.Chairman, there is supposed to be a difference between a cheer-leader and a Prime Minister.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is required here is not so much a "pep talk" to raise the spirits of hon. members opposite, but a discussion of issues that have been raised in connection with this Department, and the very important issue which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) himself said is an important issue, that a Royal Commission on Education was appointed in 1945, and it has not yet made a report.

Now, it was the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) this afternoon who brought up this word "discourtesy", and when I asked if any precedent could be cited for that, we were given a speech by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) about something that is in no way comparable. I agree entirely with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), the government has to carry out its responsibilities to the people of the province in introducing new legislation especially when it has appointed a commission that cannot report after four or five years. I agree that far, but it is an entirely different matter to announce without warning a new program in the field

of curriculum -- what could be more important? What subject of more importance was referred to the Commission than the curriculum? Why, the representations made when this announcement was made at St. Thomas were that this was going to make the most important change of the century in the educational system of Ontario.

MR. PORTER: Who said it? I did not say that .

MR. JOLLIFFE: I remember it distinctly.

MR. PORTER: I did not say that. Does the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) say I said any such thing?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but the representation was made.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. PORTER: I will sit down when I am ready, madame (Miss Macphail).

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has said so much about that, both at the time and afterwards, that I will not question him at all.

MR. PORTER: You will not honour me with that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Whether what he said I was revolutionary, I do not know.

MR. PORTER: I did not use the word "revolutionary". I am not a revolutionist.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Was it "sweeping", by any chance?

MR. PORTER: Oh, I might have done a little sweeping. I am not so sure of that.

AN hon. MEMBER: You are used to the end of a broom.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would like to know whether or not there is any truth in the report I am about to read, speaking about discourtesy.

MR. PORTER: What report is this?

MR. JOLLIFFE: This must be well founded, or unfounded, either one or the other. This report was made on November 14, -- and just let the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) contain himself -- it appeared in the Toronto Daily Star under the Headline:

"Hope Protests Porter Changes in School Work.

By Roy Greenaway

Mr. Justice A. Hope, Chairman of the Ontario Royal Commission on Education, has written to Premier Frost protesting the changes in the Ontario educational system announced recently by honourable Dana Porter, the Minister of Education".

MR. FROST: Who said this?

MR. JOLLIFFE: This was "learned reliably at Queen's Park today".

MR. FROST: Oh, now, listen, this is --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just a moment, I will read the report and if it is untrue, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can deny it. I said where it was from, and he can deal with it

MR. FROST: "It is reliably reported", is it?

MR. JOLLIFFE:

"Mr. Justice Hope's protest, it was learned, was over the timing of the Porter announcement. The Royal Commission, which has been studying Ontario education for four years, has not yet made its report, but it is known there is considerable indignation among some of the Commission's twenty-one members at being 'scooped' by the government."

Perhaps that is the word that should have been used, "scooped", instead of "affront".

"In the absence of Premier Frost today, no comment could be obtained from Cabinet sources. Asked if he had been approached by the Commission, honourable Dana Porter, Minister of Education, said every once in awhile he had occasion to talk with the Commission. He pointed out that certain members of the staff of the Department of Education were connected with the work of the Commission.

"The report at the Parliament Buildings today is that several members of the Royal Commission threatened to resign and that a protest was made directly to Mr. Porter by a high member of the Commission.

"The Royal Commission will meet all next week to work on the report."

Now, will the hon. Minister tell us, is it or is it not a fact that at least one member of the Commission did protest his announcement of last November?

MR. PORTER: I never had any.

MR. MILLARD: None?

MR. PORTER: Why would there be any protest?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am just asking if there was.

MR. PORTER: I said there was not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Because I could easily understand why there would be a protest.

MR. PORTER: Yes, but that is not what the hon. member --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Surely, under the wide terms of reference of 1945, surely no subject that was referred to the Commission was of more importance than the curriculum in the schools of this province. After the Commission has been at work four and a half years, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) announces, apparently without consulting the Commission, what I

think he described as "sweeping changes" in the curriculum of education.

MR. PORTER: I never used the word "sweeping".

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does it not strike the government it is rather odd to make announcements of that sort while such a Commission is at work?

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) lies awake at night and invents all these adjectives, "sweeping" and so on. There was never anything of the sort said.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) admitted a few minutes ago he used the word "sweeping".

MR. PORTER: I said I might have used it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You might have used it? Did you not?

AN hon. MEMBER: Here are the words "fundamental" and "drastic", right in your own paper.

MR. PORTER: That is not "sweeping".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: After all, accuracy is one of the great interests in any curriculum on education.

MR. SALSBERG: By the time it reached the dailies, it was "revolutionary".

MR. FROST: So I have come to this conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that hon. members opposite have never read this St. Thomas speech.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, we have.

MR. FROST: And I am satisfied that if they did read it, they have not the slightest comprehension what it means. I think in the interests of education in this province the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) ought to take a little time off -- and goodness knows we are short of time -- and tell them really what this does mean. Perhaps that will clarify it.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Maybe he better start over there and tell you what it means.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr.Chairman, may I say for the information of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) that some of us did read the text of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) statement at St. Thomas.

MR. FROST: Some ofyou did?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I personally read every word of it.

MR. PORTER: You thought it was pretty good stuff.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I can speak for myself. I thought it had some merit in it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: As a matter of fact, you agreed with just about every word.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, as a matter of fact, Mr.Chairman, after many years of analyzing the statements of public men, I was regretfully forced to conclude that it lacked something in clarity and the next day -- I am putting that conservatively --

AN hon. MEMBER: Oh, you do not go far enough.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The next day, when the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) was apparently astounded by the repercussions to the St. Thomas speech --

MR. PORTER: That is right. I was completely bowled over.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Completely bowled over, exactly. That is to say, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) had no understanding of the significance of what he had been saying the night before.

MR. PORTER: Oh, no, no, no.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That was apparent to us.

MR. PORTER: No, no, no. It was a great surprize to me, Mr.Chairman --

AN hon. MEMBER: When you read the speech?

MR. PORTER: -- when it became of such wide-spread public interest all of a sudden.

MR. MILLARD: I suppose you were even surprized you made the speech.

MR. PORTER: I do not know what they are insinuating, but they are always insinuating something.

(Page EE-16 follows)

MR. JOLLIFFE: Once the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) realized what public interest there was in the matter, he started making further statements.

MR. PORTER: Well, I answered the questions

MR. JOLLIFFE: His original theme was hardly clear, and unfortunately his subsequent explanations made it less clear than ever. It just increased the confusion. Speaking of adjectives, I will be most conservative about this, I will rely on the government's own adjectives, in the governments own publication, Ontario Government Services of November 15th. This is the word used, Mr. Chairman, and I say it is hypocrisy for the government to pretend it was not an important theme when they themselves used this adjective.

MR. PORTER: I never said it was not an important theme.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The adjective used is"fundamental".

MR. PORTER: All right, what is wrong with that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: "Fundamental changes in the Ontario system of education to be spread over a period of years."

MR. PORTER: That is quite different from "revolutionary" and "sleeping".

MR. SALSBERG: You had better ask me for a definition of "revolutionary".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Another adjective used was "drastic"; how about that.

MR. PORTER: That is a good word, quite accurate.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So what you did was to announce changes that were fundamental and, at least, drastic.

MR. PORTER: Well, I am very glad I did, I think it was just "on the theme" and just about at the right time, and I think it went down very well and the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) agrees with it, every word.

AN hon. MEMBER: You fellows get together over there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And you did this at a time when a Royal Commission, at great expense, had been at work on this problem four and a half years. You did it without consultation, and you still ask us to believe you need this Royal Commission and that another large appropriation should be voted for this Commission for the coming year, you still ask us to believe you are being courteous to the Commission through your voting them a large sum of money to go on being ignorred for five years more.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say that is hypocrisy, to vote a large sum of money to people you say you say you will not pay any more attention to.

MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) not think if the Commission were dissatisfied they would resign? But he is not going to wait for them to resign, to save them from being insulted he is going to fire them. They have not resigned, of course not.

AN hon. MEMBER: Of course not. Why should they when they are being paid?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would think after all the water

that has gone under the bridges, the Commission would turn in their report in any event, even if we only voted them one dollar.

MR. FROST: I just want to draw the attention of the House to these people over here who do not want to consult the Commission. One of the hon. Members up there in the group said a moment ago: "Why would they resign when they are being paid?" That is the type of people they are over there. They can face both ways, sideways, frontways and every other way at the same time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, ordinarily the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) is quite capable of discussing an issue before this House on its merits.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When he falls back on the levelling of abuse at the Opposition, then we know his case is very weak indeed.

AN hon. MEMBER: When he walks out of the House like he did this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. FROST: I did not walk out. I never walk out when you fellows are around.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I accept the words of praise which the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) accorded the members of the Commission an hour or so ago. I accept them. I concur in them. I have such a high opinion of the members of the Commission--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: --that I think after the five years they have existed, they would complete their report and turn it in even if there were no money in it for them during the coming year.

MR. FROST: Is that why you are going to take their money away from them?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, I think it would be an incentive to get the job done, and I think the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) agrees with me, nevertheless he finds himself in a position this afternoon where he is not able to disclose his real views about the matter. He would like to vote for this amendment, but being the prime minister who succeeded the original sponsor of the Commission (Mr. Drew), he does not feel free to do so, and he has my sympathy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS; Hear, hear.

AN hon. MEMBER: Well, well, well.

MR. JOLLIFFE; Let us have a vote.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I may say the Chief Justice awaits outside.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, he is twenty minutes early, is he not?

MR. FROST: Well, the Order read 'till 4:30, I think, which is the normal closing time. Perhaps we had better ask the Committee to rise and report progress, and I will not keep the hon. Administrator waiting.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; with Mr. Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply reports progress and moves to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you and the House that the hon. Administrator of the Province of Ontario, the Chief Justice of Ontario, in the absence of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, is here to give effect to certain Bills, and I ask the permission of the House to leave the Chamber in order to escort him into the Chamber.

The Honourable the Chief Justice entered the Chamber and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker then addressed the Honourable the Chief Justice as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly of the Province has at its present Sitings, passed certain Bills, to which, on behalf and in the name of the said Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour at such.

The Clerk Assistant then read the titles of the Bills that had passed, as follows:

Bill No. 3, An Act respecting the Town of Parry Sound

Bill No. 8, An Act to incorporate The Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart

Bill No. 21, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa

Bill No. 30, An Act respecting The Administration and Trust Company

Bill No. 32, An Act respecting the City of Kingston

Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act

Bill No. 87, The Marriage Act, 1950

Bill No. 90, The Audit Act, 1950

Bill No. 105, An Act respecting Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services

Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act

Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Drugless Practitioners Act

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Venereal Diseases Prevention Act, 1942

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Land Transfer Tax Act

Bill No. 114, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act, 1948

Bill No. 115, An Act to establish The Ontario Racing Commission

Bill No. 117, An Act respecting The KVP Company Limited

Bill No. 119, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act, 1946

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Planning Act, 1946

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Investment Contracts Act, 1948

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Registry Act

Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Legitimation Act

Bill No. 127, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund

Bill No. 128, The Division Courts Act, 1950

Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Public Health Act

To these Bills the Royal Assent was announced by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the following words:

In His Majesty's name His Honour the Administrator doth assent to these Bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

HON. L.M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, following what I intimated yesterday and the day before, we will meet Monday at one o'clock with a view to adjourning at five-forty-five. There will be no night session on Monday.

We will go ahead with the course we planned. We will have the Budget debate on Monday. I think the debate was adjourned by the hon. member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and if possible we would like to have the Budget debate completed on Monday afternoon, I think that would facilitate matters. I have discussed that with the leaders of the Parties. We intended to proceed with Bill No. 82, the labour matter, on Tuesday, and to meet at ten o'clock on Tuesday. We shall have to let the rest of the Estimates remain over until the conclusion of those things. That other order of business has been set and I think it would be undesirable to interrupt it.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns its present sitting thereof, it shall stand adjourned until one of the clock in the afternoon of Monday next, and Rule No. 2 of this Assembly be suspended so far as it applies to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The House adjourned 4;35 o'clock, p.m.

E I G H T H E R R A T T A

6th Erratta, Line 1, change "Volume 17" to "Volume 22".
Line 14, change "B-8" to "C-8".

Vol. 29, Page F-3, Line 41, change "absorbed" to "abolished".
Page G-9, Line 1, change "first" to "list".
Page H-4, Line 6, change "service" to "survey".
Page H-11, Line 24, after word "subsidy", insert "33⅓ percent."

Vol. 29, Page F-4, Line 23, change "1950" to "1951".
Page F-4, Line 26, delete balance of line after the word "to" and substitute therefor "to see the crown removed from the plates, as it would seem to indicate a break in the harmony and the co-operation amongst the British Commonwealth".
Line 31, after the word "and", insert "is", and after the word "empire" insert the word "ties".

Vol. 30, Page B-5, Line 23, et seq. should read: "The mere fact that the Speaker does not accept the motion, even when a motion is made, should not preclude it from Hansard. It should certainly appear in Hansard. I am sorry this situation has arisen. If you will point it out to me, I will see it is corrected."

Vol. 31, Page B-6, Line 22, change "Mr. Speaker" to "Mr. Chairman".
Page B-9, Line 25, change "Mr.Speaker" to "Mr. Chairman".
Page B-11, Line 9, " " "

Page B-13, Line 28, change "Mr. Speaker" to "Mr. Chairman".

Vol. 32, Page A-2, Line 21, change "$75.00" to $100.00".

Vol. 32, Page AA-2, Line 26, change "598971" to "598973".

Page AA-4, Line 8, complete the word "formula".

Line 9, after "no" insert "matter".

Page AA-14, Line 1, before the words "I should refer to the chief director", insert "MR. PORTER".

Page AA-16, Line 1, change "Chaplin" to "Chapman".

Line 4, before "Conquergood" insert the initials "C.L.

Line 24, change "secondary" to "Ontario".

Line 26, change "Mr." to "Dr."

Line 28. change "Tate" to "Pigott".

Page AA-17, Line 5, before "president" insert "former".

Line 6, change "women's" to "teachers'"

Before"Smith", insert "Sidney".

Line 7, change "Dr." to "Archdeacon".

Vol. 32, Page D-2, Delete lines 11 and 12.

Vol. 32, Page GG-3, Line 10, delete "union" and

Line 11, after the word "investigation", insert "he goes to the union officers".

- - - -

Volume 33.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS THIRD DAY OF APRIL, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT ONE O'CLOCK, P. M.

- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Monday, April 3, 1950
1.00 o'clock, p. m.

- - - - - -

1.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1950", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE RIGHTS OF LABOUR ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Scott (Peterborough) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Rights of Labour Act, 1944", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Is this a companion piece to the Labour Act?

MR. DALEY: Yes. It is complimentary to Bill No. 82, and it also has to do with employers and trade unions with regard to prosecution.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker I beg to present Orders-in-Council numbers OC-339/50 and OC-554/50 under the Northern Development Act, and the annual report of the Department of Reform Institutions, part I, relating to reformatories, industrial farms and common gaols for the year ending March 31st, 1949. Also the annual report

of the Department of Reform Institutions, part II, relating to training schools, for the year ending March 31st, 1949.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I beg to table answers to questions 81, 90, 49, 70, and 45.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): In view of the public concern with hit-and-run accidents, and more particularly in view of the tragic death of these two small children who were killed on Bathurst Street, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) whether he is prepared to make a statement that the law with regard to the hit-and-run drivers will be tightened up, and if it is a matter of federal jurisdiction, will the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) make a statement as to whether he will make representations to Ottawa to have the criminal code tightened in this regard.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): The law relating to leaving the scene of an accident is contained in section 285 of the criminal code which reads as follows:

> "(2) Whenever, owing to the presence of a motor vehicle on the highway, an accident has occurred to any person, or to any horse of vehicle in charge of any person, any person driving the motor vehicle is guilty of an offence and liable, either on indictment or on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and costs or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months if, with intent to escape liability either civil or criminal, he fails to stop his vehicle, tender assistance, and give his name and address. Such failure shall be prima facie evidence of an intent as aforesaid.

"(7) (a) Where any person is onvicted of an offence under the provisions of subsection 1, 2, 4 or 6 of this section the court or justice may, in addition to any other punishment provided for such off , make an order prohibiting such person from driving a motor vehicle anywhere in Canada during any period not exceeding three years."

The Ontario Highway Traffice Act contains certain provisions with reference to a person in charge of a vehicle, and it reads as follows:

"45 (1) If an accident occurs on a highway, every person in charge of a vehicle or car of an electric railway, who is directly or indirectly a party to the accident shall remain at or return to the scene of the accident and render all possible assistance and give in writing upon request to any one sustaining loss or injury or to any constable or any officer appointed for the carrying out of the provisions of this Act or to any witness, his name and address, and also the name and address of the owner of such vehicle, and the number of the permit, if any."

"(2) Any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection 1 shall incur for the first offence a penalty of not less than $25 and mot more than $100, and shalllalso be liable ti imprisonment for any term not exceeding thirty days and in addition his license or permit may be suspended for any period not exceeding sixty days, and for any subsequent offence, a penalty of not less than $100 and not more than $500 and shall also be

liable to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, and in addition his license or permit may be suspended for any period not exceeding one year."

In so far as the offence under section 45 of The Highway Traffic Act is covered by section 285 of the crimina code, it becomes inoperative, not because it was ultra vires when passed but because the Parliament of Canada has occupied the field of the Criminal law. Upon conviction for the above offence under the criminal code, section 78 of The Highway Traffic Act provides that the driver's license and owner's permit of the convicted person shall be forthwith suspended until he files proof of responsibility

In the case of the two young girls on Bathurst Street, it does not matter what the law is unless we find the offending party, and until the party is found, it is impossible to do anything about it.

If the accused is apprehended, there might be a charge of manslaughter laid, for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment, or on a conviction for dangerous driving, the maximum penalty is imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or a fine not exceeding $1000. or both.

It has been held by the Ontario Court of Appeal that the failure of the accused to remain at the scene of the accident is not relevant evidence on a charge of manslaughter but may be considered in order to determine the measure of punishment for the offence of manslaughter or dangerous driving.

That was in the case of Rex vs. Carr, 1937.

You will see that the matter in question which has given rise to this discussion today, if the party in charge

of the motor truck in question is apprehended, he might be liable to a charge of leaving the scene of an accident under article 285, and also liable to a charge of manslaughter, or dangerous driving, under the criminal code. And of course, in all these actions, when the evidence is heard, the court has to decide within the provisions of the code, and the limits of the penalties provided.

It seems to me the penalties provided in the criminal code are reasonably heavy.

If the court thinks a heavy penalty is justified, the court is empowered to impose a substantial penalty if it is proven that there is guilt under these sections. I will say this: in some cases where magistrates have imposed sentences which might appear to be somewhat light, frequently the Crown officials have taken it to appeal, asking the penalty be increased.

In this unfortunate case, everything depends on finding the driver and then proving that he is guilty. Every man under the law is innocent until proven guilty, and no one of us, no matter who, can prejudge in any case. A person is given the right to a trial, and if he is found guilty, heavy penalties are provided under the code.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion;

> "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply", Mr. Frost.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): My hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), Ontario's champion figure-skater, in delivering his Budget speech observed that it was the eighth consecutive occasion on which he had moved the historic motion, "that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply". I might also point out that this is the eighth consecutive occasion on which I have spoken to that motion and, in so doing, have drawn attention to the shortcomings of the government's financial policies and its failure to meet the essential needs of our people.

For the past several years, the government has been blithely taking credit for the effects of generally buoyant economic conditions on the provincial finances. This has made it possible for the government to ride along high, wide and handsome, brushing aside the demands of those of us who have seen long-term undermining of the economic and social welfare of our people.

All of my hon. friend's (Mr. Frost) budgest have been characterized by:

1. Inaccuracy in the budget forecasts, amounting to irresponsibility; and
2. Financial legerdemain to meet the political expediencies of the moment.

Surplusses or deficits have been delcared at will. Let us look at the record:

Forecast surplus for 1948 was $5¾ millions, the actual was $30½ millions; forecast surplus for 1949 was again 5¾ millions, the actual was $16¾ millions; forecast surplus for 1950 was 5¾ millions; actual now announced on the 17th of March is over $21½ millions. The 1951 surplus is forecast at $7½ millions, but it is quite evident that this figure does not

include the expected income from either the new logging tax or the 5 per cent personal income tax, which together should bring in over $18 millions. Thus I submit that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is already budgeting for a surplus of more than $25 million for the coming fiscal year, although he actually discloses to the public only $166,030. clearly marked as "surplus". Now there is no doubt that this kind of obfuscation has certain political advantages; but it certainly is not dealing in a straightforward manner with the public revenues which pass through government hands.

Let me give another example of what I have in mind. On Budget day, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) told us -- and these are his words -- "We receive credits from the federal government for work which is already completed on roads incorporated into the (Trans Canada highway) system", and then he added: "Our capital expenditures will, therefore, be increased by the amounts it is anticipated we will receive by way of credits, calculated on the basis of an arbitrary 50 per cent in value for the roads we have already constructed".

Now I assume that negotiations have been going on for some time between the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and the federal authorities and that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has a pretty clear idea of what Ontario roads already constructed, will be incorporated into Trans. Canada Highways. Is it not likely that some of these refunds will be made this year -- perhaps even to the extent of 10, 20 or 30 millions. If so, why did not the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) give us at least some estimate of what we are to receive instead of confusing us with the paragraph I I just quotes a moment ago. The average person readint that would get the impression that it was a mere book-keeping transaction

of some sort - a cross entry -- with no actual cash passing across the table. I feel quite certain, however, that this obscured income will be exposed to full view next year in order to place the government in the most favourable light.

Let me assure the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that I am not for a moment questioning his honesty. I am merely acknowledging his cunning.

In contrast to the government flip-flops on fiscal policy and Dominion-Provincial relations, the policies enunciated by our group during the past seven years have been clear and consistent. They have been fundamentally sound because they are based squarely on the needs of the great majority of the people of this province and of all Canada.

Let me deal first of all with Dominion-Provincial relations. I have pointed out on many occasions in this House that the various Dominion-Provincial conferences which ended in such abysmal failure did not really reflect a clash between the theories of Centralism and Federalism, although at times it suited the interests of one party, or another, to create the impression that this was the case. What really went on in 1945 - 46 was a long-drawn-out skirmish for control over the federal government apparatus -- a struggle for power -- a cold war --, and in which the Liberal Party eventually won out, and the Canadian peopel lost out. In 1945 the federal government designed and espoused an integrated plan for centralizing the tax powers and providing a modicum of social security for the Canadian people and some public investment activities to cushion the forthcoming economic slump. With the background of Tory opposition to social security measures in general, and the strong personal animosities stirred up between the Premiers of Ontario and Quebec, on the one hand, and the

the federal government on the other, the latter naturally felt quite safe in putting forth a proposal which it knew would never be accepted by the two central provinces.

Naturally, our position under these circumstances was to acceptance of the federal proposals, which were unquestionably beneficial to the people of Canada. We argued that Ontario should have signed the tax agreement in 1946 and forced the federal government into implementing its social security program. When this filed, we urged acceptance of themodified tax rental agreement, which would have removed the main excuse the federal government had for not proceeding with social security and public investment plans, and would have produced at least as good a revenue position for Ontario as ensued from the government's "lone wolf" stand, as I have demonstrated several times in this House. When the provincial government persisted in going alone, I pointed out the unassailable logic of imposing the 5 per cent personal income tax, which did not make one cent difference in the total tax to be paid by Ontario individuals. The fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) has now admitted that this should be done is a rather belated recognition of the correctness of my stand, but this does not entitle you to full forgiveness, you can hardly expect absolution for 5 per cent repentance.

However, now that the Liberal Party is temporarily firmly entrenched at Ottawa, it is turning its back on its own previouxly touted social security program. Semi-official government spokesmen are already telling us that social security measures weaken the moral fibre of the nation. The question of abolition of the means test for old age pensioners has been shunted into a committee for a "cooling off" period. The hon. Prime Minister Mr. St. Laurent, stated categorically that no government of which he is a member will enter the

field of subsidized low-rental housing. The people of Ontario want no provincial stamp of approval on any such reactionary policies, especially in the kind of economic climate into which we are heading.

There can be no doubt that objectively, the government of Ontario has played, and is now playing, an assisting role to the Ottawa reactionaries, first, by frustrating the popular desire for integrated social security and anti-depression measures; and secondly, by edging into support of the federal government's reversed position on social security. I very much fear that the new St. Laurent-Frost Axis is based on an agreement to do nothing for the people.

Having decided to pursue an independent financial policy for Ontario, the provincial government was completely derelict in its duty not to have imposed the 5 per cent personal income tax at the end of 1946. Since the federal government specifically provided for a tax credit of this amount for individuals paying the provincial tax, this did not involve any difference in tax payments by Ontario residents. It simply meant that because the Ontario government stubbornly refused to collect this 5 per cent tax, the Dominion did so. As a result, the province lost between $40 and $60 millions of revenue over the past three years. If impeachment were possible, it would not be too severe a censure for such gross mishandling of Treasury affairs. I have sometimes wondered if my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) was the treasurer of Ontario of the treasurer of the federal Liberal party.

Let us look for a moment at what useful and necessary measures might be financed with such a sum of money. My colleague and I have already stressed the urgent need for a system of cash relief for the unemployed at a minimum weekly

scale of $15 for single men or women, $20. for married men or widows with $2.50 additional for each dependent. With around 100,000 "officially" now unemployed in Ontario, there are perhaps 50,000 persons in dire need of cash relief in our province right now. At the scale we prop se, the weekly cost of cash relief to this number of people is around $1 million a week.

I have often pondered the question, is my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario, or the national Treasurer of the Liberal party of Canada. The largest contribution made to the Liberal party was made by the government of Ontario, and they used our money to reduce income tax. If they refused that, they would still have to reduce income tax to win the federal election. If the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) were in his seat, and impeachment proceedings were possible, it would not be too serious for the gross mishandling of affairs of this province, in the past few years.

I would like to read a few lines to the Housewhich I think may be very appropriate at this time:

> "Poor George. He's always wrong. But No! just recently he said: "This is not so. I stand by the statement I made.'
>
> " It's like the character in Gilbert and Sullivan's 'Utopia Limited':
>
> 'A complicated gentleman allow me to present,
> Of all the arts and faculties the terse embodiment
> He's a great arithmetician who can demonstrate with ease
> That wo and two are three or five or anything you please.

"An eminent logician who can make it clear to you
That black is white -- when loked at from the
propoer point of view;
A marvellous philologist who'll undertake to show
That 'Yes' is but another and a neater form of'No' "

Thus the millions which the government let slip through its hands by not imposing the 5 per cent income tax over the last three years would have provided a fund sufficient to pay cash relief on the scale we propose for a period of at least 50 weeks. How do you suppose the people now going hungry and with insufficient clothing feel about that!

Actually there is more perfidy connected with this 5 per cent tax business than I have so far disclosed. Frankly, I was amazed when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in announcing his reversal of position on this tax, stated that he was not only going to impose this tax now, but that he was renting the income tax field to the federal government for the amount of this tax alone! Let me quote the hon. Treausrer's (Mr. Frost) words:

"The effect of this statute would be to rent the personal income tax field to the federal government on the payment to Ontario of an amount equal to 5 per cent of the taxes paid by Ontario taxpayers to the federal authorities".

Now the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows perfectly well that there is no obligation on Ontario to "rent" the income tax field for this pittance. Under all the current proposals for re-allocation of tax powers, the provinces have had the right to impose a 5 per cent personal income tax, without incurring double taxation for their residents, whether they rented the tax fields to the federal government or not.

Thus I can only construe the present proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) to mean that in return for renting the income tax field to the Dominion all we get is the collection of the tax. What kind of a deal is this for "Old Man Ontario"?

(Take B follows)

The House will recall that I have repeatedly advocated that the present provincial corporation tax should be raised from 7 percent. to 10 percent. The total tax on corporation would then be 40 percent., which is certainly not an oppressive levy in relation either to other countries or to the inflated levels of profits in recent years. This additional 3 percent. tax would probably produce about $28 million this year.

My hon. friend did not hesitate to tax the "simple pleasures of the poor" by imposing a 20 percent. amusement tax. But how reluctant he is to tax the profits of the rich.

Well, what does all this add up to? We already have the government estimate of a surplus of $21 million on hand from the operations of the fiscal year just closing. To summarize, therefore, we would have:

From 5 percent. personal income tax . .	17 million
From 3 percent. additional corporations tax	28 million
From surplus already on hand	21 million
A total of	66 million

A rather tidy sum of money.

Who can deny that the following suggestions for appripriation of such funds for the coming year are not justified? If necessary -- and I hope it will not be -- unemployment cash relief, estimated at one million dollars weekly, $52 million; additional $10. a month to all present old-age and blind pensioners, bringing their total pension up to $50. a month, $10 million; and another measure I have mentioned several times just to balance it, half a pint of milk daily for all school children, $4 million -- total $66 million.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, although I am a city boy, I intend to say a few words about agriculture. I do not suppose

that the hon. members will expect me to say much about it, but I will say just a few words, and I will address myself to the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. McDonald) who is looking at me with very friendly eyes.

Although the majority of our people now live in cities and towns instead of on the farms, as in 1900, it is still true that agriculture is Ontario's biggest single industry. It is in this most important industry however, that we are now beginning to see the onset of the economic slump. This time Ontario farming is being hit first, although the western grain growers will also be hard hit when the British wheat contract runs out at the end of this crop year.

In large measure, the problems of the agricultural and industrial sectors of our province are reciprocal. If farm purchasing power falls, our industrial production feels the effects; if our urban purchasing power is not held up, the market for farm products falls. It is now mainly the decline in export demand for a number of our farm products which is lowering farm income. Consequently the increase of purchasing power in the home market becomes all the more important to our farmers. The housing program with which I shall deal later should enlist the support of the farm population, not only because of the rural houses that need to be built, but also because of the increased consumption of farm produce which will result from the employment created.

If the government is seriously interested in the farming areas, however, there is much more to be done than hope for the indirect benefits through stimulating other sectors of the economy. Two years ago, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Thomas) made some concrete proposals for government assistance to agriculture, which I would support. He discussed four needs, as he saw them, of research, education, extension and marketing, and, as I recall it, advocated the expenditure of some $2 millions annually on the

development of these fundamentals of agricultural science. I think these were desirable long-term measures, and I should like to see the suggestions carried out, although I do not think they will do much to alleviate the more immediate problems which are piling up on the farmers' doorstep.

I believe the Ontario government should hasten to throw its weight into the scale against the dominion government's foreign trade policies, which are now bringing serious damage to our export industries, and in particular, agriculture. As long as we demand payment in currencies which our traditional overseas buyers have not, or refuse to make loans to good customers who will take our goods, and repay us in kind in time, or prohibit the opening up of trade relations with potential new customers for our goods, we can expect to see our exports continue to decline. While I understand perfectly well that the provincial gover ment does not consider foreign trade to be one of its prerogatives, I think it is quite obvious that the addition of our voice to that of the export industries which are already being squeezed may turn the tide and force a reversal of the dominion's strangling dollar trade policy.

I wonder if the hon. members of this House have ever really stopped to consider the utter stupidity of the policies advanced to meet the so-called "dollar crisis". They run something like this:

1. Since the United States is producing a surplus of goods, Britain should be encouraged to sell more goods to the United States.
2. Britain is producing too expensively, and must, therefore, be compelled to produce more cheaply in order to be able to compete with the United States.
3. The Marshall Plan was designed to "put western Europe on its feet", in order to build up industries so that it might produce more cheaply and export more

goods in competition with the United States.

4. Canada must cut its imports from the United States and cheapen its own production (cut wages, lengthen hours, devalue the dollar) in order to export to the United States, thereby increasing the surplus of goods already piled up in the United States.
5. Economic "stability" can only be achieved by cutting the income of the people so that more foods can be produced more cheaply.
6. The lower the people's incomes the less they will be able to buy, although they are producing them more cheaply.

Such, Mr.Speaker, is the economic lunacy of 1950. I do appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) to raise his voice in protest against the restrictive trade policies of the Ottawa government, and to make his own the slogan "Trade with the World" put forward in the House a few weeks ago by my good friend from South Grey (Mr. Oliver). For that, I assure you, is the only way we can save our farmers from being reduced to the "peasant level". That is the only way to push back the growing danger of mass unemployment.

Now, I will say a few words about resource development, and I hope the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr.Frost) will listen to me. I can certainly agree with my hon. friend when he says:

> "The wwealth of our forest and minerals is a great trust and in planning our program we must have regard not only for the immediate requirements of our people but for the interest and needs of the generation to follow."

My only criticism is that this essential policy is certainly not being carried out by this government. After

stating this lofty purpose, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) goes on to mention what his government is doing. The activities he mentions are "photographing Ontario's forest resources", and "providing services to encourage prospecting". Hardly an impressive list, when compared to the colossal scale on which our forest and mineral resources are being cut down, dug up and shipped across the border to feed the maw of American processing plants. As expressed recently by the general manager of the Canadian Exporter's Association:

> "If Joe Doakes, Canadian, is to protect his heritage, maintain his standard of living and make a real start toward owning the assets of his country, he has to put emphasis on exporting processed goods instead of raw primary products."
>
> "In too many cases we are selling the cow instead of the milk; cattle on the hoof instead of canned meat; iron ore instead of steel; logs instead of lumber; pulpwood instead of paper."

The protection and development of our natural resources are clearly the responsibility of the provincial governments. In this situation, I believe the "Joe Doakes" who must get on with this job is the government of Ontario!

The plundering of our forest resources goes on at such a rate that, unless some of this wealth is plowed back in the form of rehabilitation measures, Ontario in relatively few years will lose many of the present biggest industries based on wood as a raw material.

And I pause here to remind the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that what he said in the House a few days ago when we were discussing the likely closing down of the Great Lakes Lumber Company's mills, and he said that discussions were in progress, and they were on the verge of a settlement. Well, that has become literally true. It has been settled,

and the mill is closing down on Tuesday.

In part the trouble is that such large proportions of the forest products are exported in the raw state. If these products were fully manufactured in Canada, so much more value would be created in the process that funds would be easily available for rehabilitation projects.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this problem must be attacked from every angle. The prohibition of export of pulp logs, when eventually fully effective, is good. Another desirable measure which I recommend -- and I would like the hon. Treasurer's (Mr.Frost) ear for a moment -- is a specific tax on all wood-pulp exports. Such a tax at a rate of say $2. a ton (less than 5 percent. of average export value) would produce over $1½ million additional revenue at present levels of operation. The new logging tax, we are informed, will produce over one million dollars this year, but this is not all a net gain as most of it would otherwise have been obtained through the corporation tax. These additional funds should be used to step up the present activities of the Department of Lands and Forests.

But much more than this is needed. As the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union has emphasized, the kind of forest rehabilitation program required, involves a capital expenditure of some magnitude. Since this will be assuring continuance of a very important earning asset, such an expenditure is quite properly financed by means of a bond issue. Whether the total amount required is raised all at one time, or smaller loans floated as needed, is not a matter of any consequence at this time. The important thing is that the government should adopt the principle of conserving our forest resources without any further delay. There are only two ways of doing this -- by forcing the private operators to do it, or by the government undertaking the work itself. I urge the government to appoint

a Forest Resources Commission at once to carry out the task I have just indicated.

The plunder of our mineral resources by foreign financial interests, I have already exemplified in detail by my disclosures this Session of the Steep Rock ore grab. It would, perhaps be interesting to look into also the details of the arrangements by which the Johns Manville Corporation got hold of our asbestos deposits in the Matheson Deistrict.

What I am particularly interested in here is that we shall not repeat the experience of our sister province in the exploitation of our asbestos resources. There the Johns Manville Company makes use of the Canadian miners at low wages (as was demonstrated in the asbestos strike of last summer), but ships out most of the raw product for processing and fabrication in the United States plants of the corporation. I trust that it is not too late to insist that this company fully manufacture the asbestos into end products here before exporting any of the product of our new Ontario mine. I would strongly urge my hon. friend, the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) himself in these matters and to explore the possibility of establishing a steel industry at the Lakehead.

I believe that the mining field is a logical one for the imposition of the export tax mentioned earlier as a means of forcing more manufacture of the raw material in Canada. Probably trial and error will be necessary todetermine how high the tax must be on individual products to assure that the greatest possible degree of manufacture takes place here. I would suggest starting with something like 5 percent., expressed as a specific tax on the raw product exported. For example, if we imposed a tax of this kind on some of the minerals which are now exported in large volume as raw materials we would either create new employment opportunities in Canada, or at least get some revenue which could then be used for greater

conservation work.

On iron ore exports, if we are to impose a 25 cent a ton tax would produce over $0.6 millions revenue.

On nickel exports, if we were to impose 2 cents a pound tax would produce over $5. millions revenue.

On copper exports, if we were to impose one cent a pound tax, would produce some $3. millions revenue, -- and so on, for products exported in smaller volume.

And may I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) who is always scouting about looking for new sources of taxation, that I hope he will consider this matter very carefully.

Such a tax might yield us an excess of $10. million annually.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, earlier in the Session, I referred to the present level of unemployment in our province. This, in my opinion, is not only an unhappy portent of events to come; it is a present problem with severe personal consequences for the individuals and families directly involved, I especially should like to have the ear of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) for two minutes, and I hope he will pay particular attention to what I am now saying.

> "There are many ways in which the problem of unemployment may be faced and the time for action in that respect is long overdue. Widespread unemployment today is resulting in something far more serious even than loss of vitality and despair of those who are unemployed. It is also destroying the confidence of young men and women in their own future. When they see so many others with years of training and experience, who are unable to get work, they become more and more fearful of what the future may bring for them. At the very time when they should have

"complete faith in their country and in themselves, fear is being instilled b what they see happening to the older generation. And nothing destroys either a nation or an individual so effectively as fear.

"That fear can be removed. It must be removed if democracy is to survive. I do not believe there is any country in the world where the youth have as much reason for faith in their future as in Canada. It is our job to find a way in which our mighty resources may be put to work to provide for the employment and security of all those in this country who are prepared to play their part.

"We are told these things will cost us money we cannot afford to spend. That is someth g we must not ignore. But we have spent hundreds of millions for relief, and have nothing to show for it but the despair of those who have received the money.

"Debt incurred in creating productive assets is not necessarily a burden. (Every successful private enterprise once started with a similar debt when it borrowed its capital from shareholders who had faith in the future of the enterprise.) That is the kind of debt which built Canada from a wilderness. Debt whichcreates no balancing asset is the kind of debt we must not incur. But debt incurred to give work and at the same time build assets for the future is the kind of debt we must be prepared to face."

Do you see anything wrong with that? Do you agree with that? The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is giving me the Ghandi

passive resistance look. I was hoping he would take objection to it, but it will not work.

What I have said since I called his attention to it was not my own. I was quoting George Alexander Drew, and I will use what he said to build up a bit of a case.

There is a lot of what Mr. Drew said in this House which is good -- of course, a lot of it was bad -- but there were a number of good things. He said this in 1938. He was more progressive then than he is now. Ie was out of office.

In my opinion the best possible public works weapon to fight back a depression is a low-rental housing program. It is a two-edged weapon, because it has wide economic repercussions and is flexible, and also because it is socially needed and pays the community big dividends in better health and less crime. I am saying that -- Mr. Drew did not say it.

Experience in many countries shows that the housing market is divided between three groups -- an upper income group who can afford to build their own homes without assistance; a middle income group who can afford to pay reasonable commercial rentals, or build their own homes with some financial assistance; and a lower income group who cannot afford to pay commercial rentals for satisfactory housing and, therefore, live in slum or overcrowded conditions. In Canada, the housing demand from the upper and middle groups is nearly satisfied under prospective economic conditions. And yet this is the kind of housing to which practically all government assistance has already gone. Hence the lower income group demand is the only basis for continued housing construction of real magnitude. But for this group, housing is largely an income problem.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is to this group that governments address themselves at election time. Just listen to this

from Federal Liberal Headquarters in 1945.

I will spare the hon. members opposite for a couple of minutes. This is from the Liberal Campaign Headquarters at Ottawa, in 1945. Listen to this:

> "The home is the heart of the nation, it must be sound and strong".

What were they going to do about it, these people you are snuggling up to now? Listen to this: -

> "50,000 new low-cost homes immediately; 100,000 each year for the next ten years".

We were promised bungalows costing $3,000. to be paid for over a thirty-year period at $13.82 per month, plus municipal taxes.

I wish the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would stop destroying the line of thought between the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and myself. You are depriving him of a lot of ammunition.

MR. FROST: I am listening to every word.

MR. MacLEOD: Then there was a still cheaper model, a C.D.Howe Election Special, to cost $2,000., to be paid for in 30 years at monthly payments of $9.58 a month, plus taxes. Such was the "New Social Order" promised by the Liberals in 1945. How well they learned from the Tories!

Surely my hon. friends opposite have not forgotten what they promised in 1943-44. Would you like to hear it? Listen:

> "This is what the average workman can expect to get for his outlay: a five-room bungalow of brick or frame construction, standing on its own grounds, with a lawn in front and a garden in the rear. There will be central heating and a three-piece bathroom;-a telephone and an electric refrigerator can be put in at small added cost. A garage in the rear will house his car and there will be municipal

"transportation within easy reach. The cost will be approximately $3,000. payable over a period of 20 years. This will amount to a total of $25.00 per month."

And, says the Tory pamphlet:

"This is not merely a hope or a tentative proposal. It is an actuality."

Such were the promises of the mid-forties!

The low-cost houses promised in such profusion can be had today for between $8,000. and $10,000., with down payments of $1,000. and an amortization period of 20 years at 5 percent. The ultimate cost to the purchaser will, therefore, be from $11,000. to $14,000. Now, how can the vast majority of wage earners in this province assume an obligation of such size?

I see the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is looking my way, and I am going now to his city.

Only a few weeks ago Judge Allen Fraser told an Ottawa Service Club that the National Capital's "toll of broken homes and juvenile delinquency would continue to mount unless immediate steps are taken to solve the low wage earners' desperate housing problem." "The housing shortage", he said, "is the greatest single factor contributing to shattered homes and families. None of the present housing schemes can deal with the problem of the small wage earner -- yet there are hundreds, yes, thousands, of these men in Ottawa".

Judge Fraser said he knew personally of housing conditions in the Capital that were not fit for animals. "There are", he said, "families of nine and ten trying to live in two rooms with the father and mother sleeping on the floor", and much more. Here is a news despatch from Ottawa dated March 2nd:

"Fire made 18 people, including 8 children, homeless today, when it destroyed a three-story frame house. Those burnt out bring to 120 the number who have lost homes by being burned out in Ottawa during the cold snap of the last 10 days".

And here, let me remind the House that Ottawa is not the only victim of such fires. According to an answer given to a question of mine on last years' Order Paper, they have been averaging around 13,000 a year since 1944 throughout Ontario, and in answer to the same question, they have taken the lives of 1,000 men, women and children during that period.

Perhaps in fairness to Ottawa, I should bring this back into balance. I am prepared to say now that Ottawa is far from being unmindful of the housing program.

Listen to this, from the Toronto Evening Telegram of March 22nd:

"Cost of the Prime Minister's home might hit $500,000."

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel sure that the 120 families who were burned out in Ottawa last year are going to feel comforted to know that Mr. and Mrs. St. Laurent are going to be happily housed on the banks of the Rideau River. The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent) may not believe in subsidizing low-rental homes for the small wage-earning people, but he has no objection to subsidizing a no-rental home for himself.

I think it was -- shall we say "bad taste" -- for the federal government to authorize an appropriation of that size for one man's home, when it could have been building 100 $5,000. homes for people, in the city of Ottawa.

I have often had lots of criticism for the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost), but I am prepared to say that

he would be incapable of anything like that.

Let me repeat that the type of housing now being built with government assistance is beyond the economic reach of about 85 percent. of wage earning families. Yet this is exactly the group which the Curtis Report found to be mostly living in unsatisfactory housing at census time in 1941. Since then, house building in total has hardly kept up with the increased demand resulting from new family formation. For the low-income group, the situation has gotten worse, not better. Consequently, Ontario must plan to provide during the next five or ten years something between 200,000 and 300,000 new homes for the low-income families, both urban and rural.

Naturally, it would be best if a low-rental housing program could be undertaken jointly by the province and the dominion, sharing the cost between them.

A government-sponsored, low-rental housing program provides the only means of really applying mass production methods and low cost techniques to the building industry. No doubt it would be possible to build good quality, modern homes, under mass production methods in such a housing program for substantially less than the present cost of unsatisfactory cheap houses under the N.H.A. plans.

With the demand as large as I have outlined, suppose we undertook a program of building 25,000 subsidized low-rental homes a year in Ontario for the next five years. Assume further that the average cost under mass production methods were brought down to around $6,000. Then the magnitude of the annual program would be around $150 millions, shared by both the Dominion and the Province. This is the kind of capital expenditure which would certainly fall within the category mentioned by Mr. Drew, to which I alluded earlier, as being appropriate for financing through borrowing. With the credit

standing of the province, the money could be borrowed through the medium of housing bond for a cost of between 2¾ and 3 percent. Provision should be made for the application of the actual rental paid to the purchase price of the house, so that at the end of, say, 30 years, the tenant would own the house. The subsidy necessary in a program of this kind is a much more socially desirable form of public expenditure than the distribution of relief to keep people from starving.

A housing program amounting to $150 millions a year would entail the distribution of about $56 millions annually in wages for on-site employment. This sum, at an average of $2,500. per man per year, would create 22,500 on-site-jobs.

This, together with the secondary employment created in materials manufacture and transportation would easily absorb a large percentage of present unemployment in the province.

I know the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will say that is far too big an investment for the province of Ontario, but I would remind my friend, the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) of some ancient words:

> "Cost is the father and compensation is the mother of progress."

That is a good thing to bear in mind.

Now, Mr.Speaker, the House will recall that last year I devoted a portion of my speech to the problem of mental illness and the total inadquacy of our present hospital facilities to cope with it.

I will not repeat anything I said last year, and I will be very brief on this, because the House has heard me speak on this matter several times.

I strongly urged the government to give the matter serious consideration and to appoint a Royal Commission of the best experts available to make a thorough investigation of the problem. I pointed out that we were spending almost 50 percent.

of our total health appropriation for the maintenance of the custodial institutions which we call "mental hospitals", while we were spending much less than one half of one percent. on probing into the causes of mental illness.

As I reminded the House last year, the $13,500,000. for mental institutions in current estimates does not tell the whole story, for, according to the Health League of Canada, the total cost of mental illness to Canada as a whole stands at half a billion dollars annually. It is fair to assume that the effects of one third of that figure are felt in our own province.

Now, I am very glad and very grateful that the government has launched a five-year program of hospital construction, as I proposed a year ago, and that the institution at Aurora will be opened in a few weeks, as well as the one at Smith's Falls, and that the construction of the new hospital at the Head of the Lakes is to be commenced shortly.

But we are still far from catching up with the problem, even as it was placed before us in the Speech from the Throne in 1944. At that time we were told that something over 14,000 patients were occupying accommodation planned for 11,000 persons; today it is 18,000. We were

(Take C-1 follows)

told that Ontario required five beds per 1000 population for the treatment of mental diseases, and theSpeech from the Throne acknolwedged that we needed 19,000 beds in 1944. On that basis we require 22,500 beds today,and yet we have actually added few beds since 1944. So it will be seen that the building program announced by the government, while praise-worthy, is totally inadequate.

Six years ago, Mr. Drew told us that the problem was so serious that the government had decided that two new approaches should be made to cope with it. Namely, research and prevention. "With this in mind", he said, "a division of psychiatric research has been organized with a well-known British research physician in charge". I know of no such person in the Health Department, and a study of the estimates since 1944 shows that we have spent the following amounts on psychiatric research:

1943-44	- -	$2,815.00
1944-45	- -	11,259.00
1945-46	- -	2,455.00
1946-47	- -	2,925.00
1947-48	- -	2,509.00
		21,963.00

In the past eight years, we have spent $76,000,000. maintaining mental institutions, and only $35,000. for psychiatric research, for prevention.

Then we are told that the government proposed to extend Mental Health Clinics to serve all parts of the province as soon as the 57 psychiatrists, then on loan to the Armed Forces, became available. It is my impression that very few of these men returned to the Department.

Again, I appeal to the government to take the research and prevention aspect of the problem more seriously. And again I urge you to appoint a Royal Commission on the conservation of human resources. Give it wide terms of reference, and let it investigate not only our mental hospitals, but homes for the aged and reform institutions as well. I am confident that such a Commission would help us to greatly reduce the amount of human wreckage now confined behind the grey walls of obsolete i stitutions, and thereby reduce the enormous subsidies we are having to pay as the price of social neglect. Let us stop investing money i straight jackets, and instead, invest it in the building of healthy minds.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all desire to join with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) when he says: "My chief pride is that I am a Canadian". It is indeed a great privilege to call oneself a citizen of such a land. A land for which, whithin my own lifetime, 100,000 of our best sons laid down their lives.

The hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) recalled for us the great achievements of the first half of this century, and the tremendous developments of our forests, mills and mines. He did not point out that while those mighty developments brought riches to a few men, they did not provide, as they should have done, security for the many.

I would like to refer to something that happened in the House some years ago when hon.Minister of Health (Mr.Kelley) was present. He sent me a note of some of the things said. I kept that note, and he said that the biggest room in Ontario is the room for improvement. It was most trite coming from hon. Minister of Health (Mr.Kelley) and no one has shown a greater concern for people than he has.

Do we of this generation feel proud when we read the Kennedy Report? Do we feel proud when we read of thousands of Canadians in this land of abundance going hungry, sleeping without covering on the hard floors of local Missions? Do we feel proud when we read of the shocking housing conditions in our province? Do we feel proud of the conditions in our mental hospitals? Do we feel proud of the way in which we treat our aged folk -- our senior citizens? Do we feel proud when, in one Ontario community, 20 percent of the population are publicly branded as undesirable second-class citizens?

I looked at that bronze tablet the other day, outside the East Chamber, and this is what it says:

> "In Honour and Memory of the Coloured Men of No. 2 Construction Battalion C.E.F. Who Volunteered their Services and Lost Their Lives in the Great War 1914-1919. Erected By The Coloured People of Canada".

Yet, in Dresden, the people of the same race and the same colour of skin, cannot be served in restaurants.

When we claim the right to call ourselves Canadians, let us acknowledge the duty that accompanies that right.

Mr.Speaker, it is my sincere and earnest hope that this Legislature, under the leadership of the government, will so tackle the urgent economic and social problems facing our province today, and so meet the needs of the people, that future generations will be our debtors and not our accusers.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): In rising to participate in the Budget Debate, my remarks will not be too long, because a number of points have been already covered, and it not be necessary for me to repeat them.

However, there are one or two points on which I would like to give my personal opinion, because I do not think that we are

actually contemplating any serious action in this direction.

The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has covered one of the subjects which I had intended to speak on, very adequately, and he has covered two or three other subjects, on which I as going to speak; so I will try to limit my remarks.

There are two problems in existance in this province, and which have been in existance for some years, and they are problems affecting every family in the lower income bracket. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) spoke about the housing situation; it has improved somewhat over last year, but it has not improved to the extent that the middle-class and lower income bracket require. Certainly not in the direction of housing that families can afford.

I was noting in the Record Despatch that no competent authority over the past few years has made a statement to the effect that there is any intention of alleviating the problem of housing for the lower income bracket. I was struck by the statement in the 1941 census for Canadian cities: and the Curtis Report on Housing 1944, citing 1941 census for 27 major Canadian cities:

Family Income	Percentage Living in Overcrowded Dwellings
$0 to $499	40 %
$500 to $999	29 %
$1,000 to $1,499.	20 %
$1,500 to $1,999.	15 %
Over $2,000.	12 %

George S. Mooney, consultant to the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, speaking in Winnipeg in August 1947 said:

"Fully 45 percent of Canadian families cannot be provided with modern shelter accommodation within

"the framework of the existing housing legislation and financial facilities."

That was in 1947.

Following these reports, we find quoted in the Globe and Mail on the 23rd of September, 1948:

"Kingston, September 21 (Staff). 'No hope for solving the housing crisis is within sight, and I will be amazed if costs come down", D.B.Mansur, President of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation told the closing session of the annual convention of the Ontario Municipal Association today.

"The best news Mr. Mansur could offer was to say that the situation is not likely to get worse. He meant by this that the Dominion Government expects that 85,000 housing units will be completed this year, but there will be an additional 90,000 family groups in need of housing by the end of 1948 (because of marriages).

" 'Our estimates today show that 800,000 household groups in Canada are sharing accommodation, and of these about 250,000 families wish to have a place of their own', he said."

And then we have an article in the Canadian Welfare of January, 1949, by Humphrey Garver, who is supervisor of research for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation at Ottawa,and this is what he has to say:

"It is true that about one million houses have been built since 1924, and that almost a third of all the housing we now possess has been constructed during this period. But there are now almost a million and a quarter more families than there were in 1924. The numbef of families is now increasing

at the rate of 90,000 a year, and with housing production at record volume, we are now building at the rate of only 80,000 units a year. Not only has the production of houses failed to keep pace with the net increase in the number of families, but it must also be recognized that the stock of houses with which we entered the period is now a quarter-century older.

"The plain fact is that the population is in many respects less adequately housed today than it was in 1924. Though there have been some technical advances in household mechanical apparatus, yet there has been remarkably little change in the quality of housing produced; the typical house of the 1940's is smaller than that of the 1920's. Industrialists may well ponder the fact that in spite of all their technological 'know-how', it now costs exactly twice as much to build a house as it did before the war."

The government's own "Curtis" Report in 1944 (Chapters 5 and 6) showed that at least one-third of Canada's families (in the lower-income brackets) could not obtain proper housing unless their rent was subsidized.

"Canada has lagged behind the example of European countries, of Great Britain, and of the United States, in providing greater governmental assistance for housing as a matter of welfare and public concern.....

"The subsidies required for the purpose of permitting rentals to be set lower than the economic or commercial level should be provided by the Dominion government in the form of annual grants.....

"That a very large and long-range program of low-rental housing must be contemplated is an inescapable conclusion from the available facts....

"One of the blind spots in thinking of housing policy is the belief that low rents mean rents of the order of $20 - $25. or even more, when considerably lower figures are necessary for unskilled and low-wage workers, workers whose employment is irregular, or families with more than the average number of children.....

"In view of all the circumstances of the Dominion situation, the most expeditious and desirable system is that the federal government should contribute the main capital costs....."

In the three years, 1946, 1947 and 1948, of every $100 spent in construction in Canada, only $33. was spent on housing -- roughly one dollar out of every three. The rest was spent on building banks, breweries, bowling alleys, clubs, theatres, new store fronts, garages, et cetera.

From January, 1945, to January, 1949, inclusive, contracts for construction in Canada totalled $2,812,651,000., of which only $1,003,352,000. was for housing. Thus, of every hundred dollars spent on constructions in this period, only $35.67 was spent on housing.

The reason I have made reference to statistics is because we have run into problems of housing and there is always the tendency to say that it is in the Federal jurisdiction, but if it is in Federal jurisdiction, the fact remains it does n t mean the Federal jurisdiction will find the proper answer to the problem. It seems to me that as long as the problem exists we must do something about it. If I

had a child sick and my family needed a pension, I would not say that was my wife's problem and that I was not concerned, if a child had a cold. It is a joint family problem and that cold could run through the whole family. You have to work as a team. It is possible that the Federal Government intends that the Federal, Provincial and the municipal authorities will form a team. I don't know how it will work. There have been indications that something would be done, but nothing has materialized so that we have low-cost housing for those people who need it. I was struck by the point raised by a veteran of the last war, and I have chatted frequently with these veterans who contact me personally and we have chats, and they come to see me very often. This veterans said he was living with his inlaws and that he had a bit of money when he came back to Canada in 1945 or 1946 and he had his gratuities and went back to work but when his gratuities were gone, he found the cost of living so high and with his gratuities gone, he could not make up the difference in his income and the actual cost of living. He said that he felt no problem until his gratuities ran out and then he realized that his income was below his cost of living. He said, "I am this position, I have not enough money to buy a house, nor enough income to pay the rent necessary to accommodate my family," and he said, "I cannot get assistance anywhere." I am told that this is a general problem and something must be done.

Well, that situation has spread into many provinces and I am coming back to the veterans' position again. Bear in mind that the veteran gave up a great deal and he was promised, as I said last year in my maiden speech, that

there were two things he would not have to worry about when he got back to this country and the first was employment and the second was housing. The married soldiers, particularly, were most concerned about that and they felt that there were two things they would not have to worry about. But here is the situation, veterans when they got home could not find houses and if a veteran did have a house he would have to sell the house because he could not carry the mortgage. The result is they were operating on a thin margin and now they are stuck. Some are hoping and hoping that they will find homes but they have not been successful and there are some in small bungalows and they live in the basements and have to sublet the first floor so that they will have enough money to pay the difference between their personal income and the costs of maintaining the bungalow. There are a great many people in that situation and that is not an unusual situation. I think this is important and should be taken into consideration. This is one person, but it is probably the same in the case of a good many others.

I say it is impossible to say to these men who cannot pay rent for two or three rooms and keep a roof over themselves:

"You buy a house." They are not able. No one is building a house that these men could buy. The answer is they cannot buy and we have to acknowledge the fact they cannot buy until something happens to our economy so that they could get a greater income. We have to recognize the fact that the answer is, there is little rental housing to meet the needs of these people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FELL: The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has mentioned the subject of overcrowding and I think

his estimate waslow. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) said something on housing and overcrowding and I know that it is true. I have been into some of these congested areas in Toronto and I have found out what is happening, there are family quarrels. A man and woman who have been living together for 25 or 30 years in happy relationship, now because of overcrowding, are quarrelling and bickering. They have to open their doors to allow others in because of this overcrowding; they have to allow their sons and daughters and families to come into their houses and it ends up with quarrelling and bickering and arguing. A man and a woman have lived together for 25 years happily and then because of this arguing and bickering on account of overcrowding there arises the problem of separation. I have heard that story many times as has every hon. member of this House has who lives in a large city area. The father goes his way and the mother goes hers, maybe the father ends up living in a hotel and they become separated. And with this overcrowding you are likely to meet up with skin disease and disease to children and I don't think that we realize the toll that overcrowding takes on our people. Take today the average home in Ontario, the young married couples probably have two children or perhaps three and in some areas, in these crowded conditions, the father comes homewith a cold or some member of his family possibly having one, and with only two or three rooms and very little separation in the rooms, the mother would catch the cold and then there is the likelihood that the children will catch it and that situation continues. The cold goes throuh the family and sometimes flu and sometimes pheumonia might result to all members of the family. This is a great problem and it has cost me, and hundreds of people like me perhaps $100.00 for.....

sickness, for which there should have been no need. My own child this winter went to the hospital with a serious throat infection and the doctor said it was on account of crowded conditions. And at the same time there were four other children in the hospital, two of whom died, and this illness was due to overcrowding, catching it from one of the other children or possibly from a parent. One child could get an infection and probably infect three or four others.

The people in the low income tax bracket have to have proper homes. That is the spirit of Christianity, and if the father wants to stay home instead of escaping from the dilemma, there must be proper housing conditions provided. When you have split homes and disease and crime amongst adults, it is an absolute destruction of morale. And perhaps what is even more important is that people living in these conditions can stand it only for a short time and then there is a general breakdown and they lose their social responsibilities. What does that mean? It means the complete loss and destruction of that for which we live. You can guess what happens after that.

(Take D follows)

As I said, these are problems which directly affect this Provincial Government, and are not the problems of the municipalities. These are additional costs to the municipalities, and it always turns out that the municipalities have to come to the Provincial Government for financial assistance. My suggestion would be that we make a greater investment in the economy of this province. Let us build homes. If this government has to go into the house-building business, let us go into it---let us build homes.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FELL: There have been references made to hon. members on this side of the House which were not flattering . Many hon. members on the other side, in speaking, have pointed to us, and it is said we are a group of "blunderers" and a "group of gloom-mongers." I say, Mr. Speaker, that statement is not true. The hon. members on this side of the House do not care whose business it is, as long as it is done. There are many hon. members here who could be doing more useful jobs than sitting here, trying to convince the govdrnment these are necessary things which they should do. Politics should not have anything to do with it at all.

I will make reference to a point which will cover my suggestion in this case. I will skip some of the things I wanted to say and come directly to the question of unemployment. Several hon. members have spoken in this House, and have established the fact that the present unemployment situation is not seasonal. There are a great many more things enter into this question on unemployment at the present time. It cannot all be blamed on seasonableness.

I have a quotation indicating this, fromthe Globe & Mail of the 21st of March, which says:

"Labor market picks up, but jobless total still 25% above last year."

It goes on to say:

"While there has been an expected seasonal drop in registered unemployed in Canada from the peak figure reached in February, it has failed to pick up the slack, leaving the total 25% higher than last year."

That destroys the fallacy we have been operating under for some time, that this was a seasonal problem. It is not.

Some of the hon. members in speaking have dwelt on the fact that a great deal of it is due to the loss of foreign trade markets, and many other things. Amongst them, I think some hon. members have mentioned this fact, but there is a considerable amount of unemployment right across Ontario, which could be laid at the door of many employers. Perhaps up to a point, they are justified. The situation in many cases is this---and it is true to some extent---that during the war the employers made an all-out effort, caused by war requirements, and could not replace broken-down machinery in plants. In fact, they were asked by the government to hold up their demands for new machinery until after the war. This they did. And what some of them at least have developed is a fairly efficient system of production, and I think they also developed a very efficient system of profit-making as well. They did not seem to lose very much money at it. The fact is that after the war, there was a certain amount of time required for conversion, and there was still a period in which these changes could not be made, and we operated perhaps up until 1945 or 1946 under those conditions. But during the last two years we have seen this happen; first of all, the companies did make changes in their machinery,

as a matter of fact, but they went further than that, and they changed their entire method of production. They are today bringing in those efficiency experts---a move which was not followed during the war so much---and they proceeded to cut off certain jobs, they go through the shops here and there, and they say: "You are out," "You are out," "You are out," and they say: "Instead of the men here, we will use a moving table," or "Instead of the men here, we will use an electric drop."

Tremendous changes have taken place in all phases of industry in this province in the last year and a half, and a great many men have been thrown out of work. When we are dealing with the situation of men being thrown out of work, to any great extent, I think they find themselves in a very serious position. For instance, at the present time, there is a tremendous move on foot to get rid of those men who are sixty years of age or over. Where do they find themselves? They are out on the street. They claim they are too old to be of use to any one, and yet they are too young to die. Nobody wants to hire a man of that age.

The employers say: "We have to maintain our efficiency to keep ourselves in the competitive business of the markets of the world, and Jones has to go. He has been forty years with the company, but that does not mean anything to us. We are forced to do it. We do not want to do it," and so on.

I think I am right in saying that the increase in unemployment in this province is directly due to many serious changes employers are making in their method of production and so on.

Some of them have even made statements. I was quite surprised to read a statement made by a very important man, one probably known to those people interested in industry,

a gentleman by the name of William L. Kleitz, Vice-president of the Guaranty Trust Company. He made this statement the day before Christmas, December 24th, 1945:

> "I think that depressions are inevitable under the free enterprise system, and the best we can do is try and lessen their depth and duration."

Well, we did not do a very good job before. On the same day, another gentleman, Mr. J. W. Scoville, of the Chrysler Corporation, is quoted as saying:

> "If the people living in slums don't like them let themmove out. Some people like to live in one room shacks. There is no solution to this problem. Certainly Industry doesn't intend to attempt the impossible.....ONE OF THE WORST FALLICIES TODAY IS THAT EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO A JOB."

That was a Christmas box given by these gentlemen to the workers in this country---Christmas Eve 1945.

That is a clear indication to me that many important people in free enterprise and industry have no intention of trying to solve this problem. They merely say:

> "We cannot attempt to solve the unemployment problem and the housing problem, because that is not our business. We are in business to make money. That is the concern of our government."

When this question was raised with the Federal government, we find in the House of Commons Hansard, dated April 12th, 1945, the Rt. Hon. C. D. Howe made this statement when he was discussing the government white paper at that time:

> "Perhaps we will have to have at all times a shelf of public projects already planned and saved

"to be used when needed to stimulate employment in any given area."

Following on in the Hansard report, in reply to a question asked by Mr. M. J. Coldwell, the leaderof the C. C. F. Party in the Federal House of Commons, "How many men will be employed on this project when started?", Hon. Mr. Winters said:

"At the end of one month, 2500; at the end of six months, 17,000, and at the end of a year, approximately 30,000."

Well, what is the unemployment in Canada today? Close to 400,000, and yet at the end of one year the government, on a Federal level, only indicated by their plans that there would be jobs available for approximately 30,000 people. That kind of planning is no good. We have busimessmen who say it is the Federal Government's responsibility, and we have the Federal Government saying: "All right, it is our responsibility, and here is what we will do." But that is not the story.

Here is a statement of March 5th, from the Globe & Mail, quoting Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent in Ottawa, speaking to a delegation of the Canadian Congress of Labor. He had this to say:

"Mr. St. Laurent said in his own city of Quebec there was an example of a population growing faster than new jobs are created.

"But we are not entirely without policies he said. The shelf of public works projects was not bare. There still were many projects ready to be launched whenever 'We feel that by launching them we will increase the over-all activity of the construction industry.'"

It seems to me that with an unemployment list of nearly 400,000, if we have any works projects, they should beput into action immediately.

I might say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that this problem of unemployment has been charged to one source and another. If business says "It is not our responsibility," and if the Provincial Government says it is a Federal jurisdiction, and the Federal jurisdiction says: "Yes, it is our responsibility, and we have certain plans," I say they do not mean a thing. In the meantime, who is suffering the most? The municipalities in the Province of Ontario are taking the brunt, and they have asked for a Dominion-Provincial Conference, and I think that is the answer to the whole problem at the moment---perhaps not the complete answer, but at least a step in the right direction. As I say, it may not be the answer, but if the answer is going to come from any source, certainly the ones who are feeling the brunt should have it answered.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there should be called immediately a Provincial-municipal conference to discuss these problems, and any other problems which may be relevant at the moment, certainly, if for no other reason than to find out the answer to the housing and unemployment problems.

We have attended with delegations to the City Council in Toronto, and pointed out the unemployment situation, and those at the City Hall say: "That is all right; we appreciate that; we know how many unemployed we have, but we are not able to help; it is outside our limits." I think we will have to press the City of Toronto itself for an answer, and see if they cannot find the money for increasing the cash allowances to unemployed employables, and to those who are actually unemployed.

It is true that the unemployed are from every munici-

pality in Ontario, and they are sweeping down on Toronto, and that is helping to destroy whatever provision the City of Toronto may have made in an effort to solve the problem in this area.

That happened in the last depression. If you take the list of those unemployed on the City of Toronto, I do not think there is any doubt but you will find that many of them are not residents of the City of Toronto at all.

And so I say that in my opinion a step forward in the solution of the unemployed problem, is to call immediately a Dominion-municipal Conference, so that some pattern may be discussed which will be applicable to all the province.

You know that a Provincial-municipal conference is not anything new for the Conservative Party. In 1941 or 1942, the former leader of the government of this province, Mr. Drew, promised a Provincial-municipal conference, and at the Progressive-Conservative meeting in Toronton, in 1943, Alderman Fleming brought forward a resolution from the City Council of the City of Toronto asking for a Provincial-municipal conference, and that was agreed to.

I suggest, in conclusion, we may not get the full answer, but I think this is certainly a situation where those who dispute the jurisdiction and the responsibility, are not the ones who suffer. I lived in the country just after I was married, and I moved into a small town, and about the second day I was there I was approached by the Fire Chief who said: "We have two permanent firemen. Our fire staff is made up of volunteers. Will you volunteer?" I said: "Yes." I have been pulled out of bed at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning to go out into the country, perhaps 20 or 25 miles to fight a fire, and I have read in the papers on at least three occasions

where houses have burned down while two fire departments sat looking at each other, trying to decide whose responsibility it was to put the fire out.

This unemployment situation is a fire sweeping across the country, and whether we like it or not, it will sweep across the Province of Ontario, and leave some very disturbing things in its wake.

I suggest that something be done at once in an endeavor to try and solve these problems. I will close by saying that I think the Provincial-municipal conference would at least provide some of the answers to those problems.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page D-9 follows)

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, even at this belated hour, I wish to assocate myself with the previous speakers in voicing my appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, for the splendid manner in which you have discharged with impartiality and dignity all the duties of your high office.

May I also avail myself of the opportunity to tender my felicitation and good wishes to the former members who have assumed Cabinet ranks since the last Session.

My congratulations also extend to the mover (Mr. Reynolds) and seconder (Mr. Leger) of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne for the masterly delivery of their speeches.

I was greatly impressed by the extend and magnitude of the achievements and improvements in the lot of the people of North Cochrane in the last decade or so. I believe that no small part of the credit for it all rightly belongs to the former member of North Cochrane who sat on this side of the House for a period of nearly fourteen years. He gave his time unsparingly to the Liberal cause and his loyalty and devotion to duties and to his constituents were second to that of no other members. I would therefore take the liberty of submitting to the new Hon. member of North Cochrane (Mr. Leger) the name and the career of Joseph Habel as an ideal and inspiration for his future guidance, and if perchance he should be called upon to serve his constituents for a period of over fourteen years. God forbid, I hope and I trust that fate and his fellow citizens of North Cochrane will deal him a better political future than that handed over to our good friend, Joseph Habel.

I was also greatly impressed by the high hopes raised by the member for Leeds in relation to great power developments

on the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers in the near future. I do not wish to raise any dissenting voice. On the contrary, I am very much in accord with any policy dedicated to the purposes of setting up of a greater number of industries in Eastern Ontario. I trust accordingly that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) will carry on the crusade of this most legitimate ambition with such vigour determination and singleness of purpose so that he may command not only the respect but also the assent and co-operation of all the members of the Conservative party to his views. As you are all very much aware we shall be blessed with an abundance of electric power at our disposal in the Ottawa Valley. With this added inducement and with the co-operation of the Department of Planning and Development, it should be an easy matter to attract risk captial for commercial and industrial ventures; in the Ottawa Valley and in the Upper St. Lawrence region. I recall that in years passed by, member after member of the eastern section of this province were advocating and demanding uniformity of power rates all over Ontario in order to foster and promote industrialization of their respective ridings. They were then appalled as we are now still appalled nowadays by the young generation deserting from the farm, the community, the village, and the small town towards the larger centres in order to eke out a living and build up a worthwhile future for themselves which they could not and cannot now secure close to their homes and birthplaces. This is a human problem, which calls for an early solution.

If my memory serves me right, up to this date, the arguments against such a policy of uniform provincial power rates were to the effect that power would be delivered to a given place at cost price, whatever it may be and any additional power lines

to promote industrial expansion would be erected only in case of a real, actual and existing power demand from industrial concerns to such an extent as might warrant the expenditures.

Under such circumstances and conditions, the Capitol City of Ottawa and that of Cornwall were the only cities in Eastern Ontario which were able to contribute in a very limited sense to the cause of greater employment by way of industrial expansion.

The people living by the banks of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Rivers are now very much conscious of the fact they will have at their disposal, in the very near future, at their very doorsteps, a tremendous amount of electrical power, which is the very foundation and cornerstone of industrial prosperty. Their ship is about to come in with this perspective in mind they do not wish to be sold down the river for the glory and benefit of business, commercial and industrial expansion in some other part of the Province.

The home life, communityand family ties in Eastern Ontario are just as strong and appealing as anywhere wlse in Ontario if not more so. The future and the well being of the younger generation and their advancement in life close to their home and birthplace is just as dear to the mothers and fathers living in Eastern Ontario as it is to those living in any other section of this Province. The people of Eastern Ontario are now looking forward to the new power developments as part of their heritage and patrimony to be used abundantly for their own benefit.

May I add that should we be sold down the river, Eastern Ontario may also be sold across the river by the same policy. The possibilities of achievement of the Gatineau Power Company are not to be dismissed very lightly. It may be that if we should not pay sufficient attention to the perspective or meet the

facts and heed the warning, the centre of gravity of business and industry in the Ottawa Valley may very well be shifted to the Quebec side. I was amazed to learn that by reasons of industrial expansion, the population of the federal constituencies of Hull had now reached close to 80,000 to be compared with 52,000, according to the 1941 census. At the moment there is no indication that the pace of growth is likely to slacken in the near future by any means.
As a passing reference may I point out that only a few days ago, the hon. Premier of our sister Province (Mr. Duplesis) served notice upon the Gatineau Power Company to move their head office from Ottawa to theQuebec side. The significance of this imperative order may yet have to be assessed in terms of future implications.

It is therefore by submission, Mr. Speaker, that a policy of fostering and promoting industrial expansion in the Eastern segment of the Province is a matter of great concern to all of us and the proper authorities should give it their immediate and relentless attention. In so doing may I assure this House that they will receive the utmost assistance and co-operation from every citizen in Eastern Ontario to the fullest extent of their capacity in any desirable wayshape or form. We are looking to the near future with great expectation and any frustration will bring about great disillusionment, disappointment and resentment.

Coming now to the budget as a whole, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Treasurer of the Province (Mr. Frost) by reason of its surplus and huge contribution to the sinking fund of the Consolidated Revenue of the Province now stands on the horns of a dilemma; either he has taxed the people beyond the scope of requirements, or else he has failed to contribute

adequately to the welfare and well-being of most deserving causes in this Province. We are in favour of sunshine budget but we shy at its fulfillment when brought about at the expense of excessive taxation. This practice, in my opinion, should be stamped out without any further delay.

In 1947 the budget forecast a surplus of $367, 143 for 1948, plus $5,499,300 to be applied to sinking fund and certificates. But in 1948 the budget announced that the surplus was instead $25,039,000 (the final figure was even higher), plus $5,499,000 applied to sinking fund and certificates.

In 1948 the budget forecast a surplus of $262,979 for 1949, plus $5,562,000 to be applied to sinking fund and certificates. But 1949 the budget announced that the surplus was instead $1,132,000, plus $15,562,000 applied to sinking fund and certificates.

(Take E follows)

In 1949 the budget forecast a surplus of $157,546 for 1950, plus $5,626,200 to be applied to sinking fund and certificates. But the 1950 budget now announces that the surplus is instead $1,004,000, plus $20,626,000 applied to sinking fund and certificates.

The new budget forescasts a surplus of $166,030 for 1951, plus $7,198,000 to be applied to sinking fund and certificates. Unless propserity collapses, we cannot regard this as a likely result. It is the "poor mouth" again. It may, of course, serve to modify municipal requests for assistance.

In this connection, I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words with respect to Social Security and Education in relation to the reconvening Dominion Provincial conference next fall, and also in relation to its impact on the Provincial and Municipal levels of Government.

I was fortunate enough this spring to listen in on one of the sittings of the Provincial Dominion Conference for the purpose of amending our Constitution. I proceeded to the House of Commons in with the expectation of hearing rousing, indignant and defiant speeches from the provincial Premiers rallying to the defence of entrenched provincial rights, but to my amazement, I found myself listening to the proceedings of what seemed to have been well described as a meeting of members of a mutual admiration society. There was not a single derogatory remark made at any time with respect to unity, liberty or duplicity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: I am further told that following the official adjournment, the guests were invited to an adjoining room for refreshments for additional unofficial discussion, and I understand that then and there all the remaining

difficulties were dissolved as a cubicle of sugar in a cup of tea to which may have been added a dash of sweet cream.

Quite rightly the politidans of our day had resolved to call a truce and to become great Canadians and great statesmen for the future welfare of our country. Leading the way in the vanguard of the proponents of this proposition, was none other than our Premier who, in so doing, brought about great honor not only upon himself, but also upon all the members of this Legislature and upon the whole population of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHALTRAND: The results became apparent very soon and ultimately was reached an unanimous agreement in principle upon the desirability henceforth of amending our Constitution in Canada, by Canadian means without resorting to the good offices of the Imperial Parliament. This achievement to my way of thinking is an unmistakeable sign that as Canadians we have reached the stage of mature thinking and the capacity, ability and courage for plain and forthright talk.

The conference is to reconvene next fallfor the purpose of re-allocating the field and the power of taxation and also proceed to a new distribution of the responsibilities as between the various levels of Government. This meeting is called for the main purpose of settling and adjusting the financial differences between the senior Governments. However, it is my contention that the municipalities are the children of the provincial governments and if they are not to be heard, their vital interests, to all intents and purposes, should be properly and diligently looked after by the delegates of this House.

The munciipalities, as we are all aware, are the ailing form of government in our present setup and it is clearly reflected by the excessive municipal taxation on real estate

properties, and incidentally on high rentals, due in no small measure to social services charges and to an unbearable contribution towards education.

The municipalities are now in need of immediate assistance far more than any other level of government in this country, if they are expected to carry on their present burden of responsibilities. In the alternative their duties in the fields of social services and education should be drastically curtailed and limited. In 1867, the Fathers of Confederation devised a Constitution according to their own lights and on the basis of the requirements of their time. They could not forsee, by any stretch of the imagination, the tremendous changes and advances that would be brought about in this country in the march of time. Believing that the level of government closest to the people would be the best government, municipalities came into existence and they were given power of taxation on the greatest source of wealth at that time, namely real estate property. Times, however, have changed and real estate is no more the greatest and main asset of capital and revenue.

Two events of tremendous historical importance have completely altered the picture of former days. Firstly the possibilities of hydro power were explored and truly assessed, with the result that this country has ceased to be governed primarily on the basis of a pastoral and agricultural social economy and a gradual transformation has carried us into an industrial, business and commercial world. Secondly, the extraordinary and stupendous development of communication and technology in recent years has completely set aside our former conception of space, distance and of time with all its incidences.

In former days a journey from the Atlantic to the

Pacific involved several months of travel. Today the distance may be spanned in a matter of six or seven hours. With the radio and the telephone, it is now possible to carry on a conversation over several hundred miles as easily as if speaking from one porch to another or from one room to the other. There is also the contributions of the wireless, the telegraph, the automobile and the railways which are bringing each day our people closer together and reducing to insignificance the element of distance between our frontiers.

We are now a closely knitted people thanks to the discovery and inventions of new means of communication. Accordingly we must adjust our ways of life and our forms of government against novel backgrounds and outlooks with different rules and formulas, with fresh patterns and techniques for solving new problems and demands in the lights of the foregoing changes.

One of the most pressing problems of our day is a social security program for the underprivileged. The leaders of free enterprise and the owners of wealth who believe themselves firmly entrenched in a conception of absolute ownership and deliberately refrain from assuming their responsibilities for the human welfare of their workers or fellow-citizens are in great error. It is a kind of error which could very well be fatal. To my way of thinking, they are solely the trustees of a community's wealth, and although entitled to the enjoyment of their property rights to a limited extent, they must also at all times take into account the dependence of the people on such wealth and should never use it to the gross detriment of the general welfare of the community, or of any important segment of it. Furthermore, they are their brothers' keepers to the fullest extent of the word and to the limit of

their ability. More than at any time before, they must now assume their full share of responsibility towards that end.

Labour is getting restless and for good reasons. In these uncertain times al all-embracing social security program from the cradle to the grave is a matter of great concern for the underprivileged classes of people in our society. They are firmly resolved never to return to the infamous and inhuman conditions which prevailed during the dark period of unemployment in the early thirties. And I know of legions and legions of persons who would not lift a little finger to defend our system of free enterprise if it cannot or will not measure up to the task at hand. Quite rightly, it has been said often enough and repeated over again that forms of government are only a technique to an end and not an end in themselves. All forms of governments in their ideals aim at the betterment of the people and of mankind by way of different techniques.

In North America, and in this province more particularly, we are living under a democratic system of government with a free enterprise economy. If it is worthwhile to live under such a system, I say it is worthwhile defending it and winning peace for it from within and from without.

Mr. Speaker, I am by no means a doctrinaire likely to become a rebel if I should not have my way all along the line, neither am I possessed of the fanaticism of a torch-bearer or of a wild-eyed crusader.

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): You are wild-eyed, though.

MR. CHARTRAND: My only ambition in this House isto advocate reforms now and then to keep our laws abreast of the

times so that they may serve to meet the requirements of our day. My political creed could be very well summed up with the angels' words on a Christmas night thousands of years ago, "Let us render glory to God in Heaven and on earth peace amonst men of good will".

The underprivileged classes of society are requesting now a just fair and reasonable system of social security to take care of their plight in their hour of need and as men of good will we should surrender to this demand. The need now is for an agreement with the provinces or an amendment to the Constitution which would make the project possible.

Accordingly it is my suggestion that the delegates at the next Dominion-Provincial Conference should tear down the barrier and clear the way for the implementation of a social security program on a free or contributory basis without any further delaying action. Time is not running in our favour and it is my considered opinion that the last thing on earth that parties in authority would wish to be accused of would be of giving too little and too late.

I would like now to direct my remarks to education. We delight in boasting about the tremendous amount of money we spend for education and the increased financial assistance given by the province for that purpose from year to year. We point out with great pride to the palatial structure recently erected for school purposes and the first-rate equipment that goes with it.

In the Budget address this year we are reminded amongst other things that two hundred and eight new schools or substantial additions to existing schools have been completed at a gross construction cost of about $25 millions providing new

accomodation for more than 27,000 pupils. In the coming year it is expected that 228 school buildings will be completed providing facilities for an additional 32,000 pupils. We are also reminded that we are gradually overcoming the shortage and that very shortly the province will compare favourably with any similar area in Europe or North America.

And yet we say very little as to the plight of the teaching staff. Their lot calls for close examination, thorough investigation and remedial action in the not too-distant future if we wish to attract the right type of people to the teaching profession. In an article entitled "The Thankless Profession", Mr. Hugh MacLennan, a former teacher and the author of "Barometer Rising", "Two Solitudes" and "The Precipice" --

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: From Nova Scotia.

MR. CHARTRAND: -- had this to say about teachers:

> "The most exploited, neglected and underprivileged class in Canada are not people the comfortable classes never see. They are not sharecroppers, migrant fruit pickers, sweat-shop girls or fishermen in outposts. They are the nation's school teachers. If we were rational about our attitude towards the teaching profession, the plight of our teachers would not be on our conscience and something sensible would have been done long ago to remedy the disgraceful situation now existing in Canadian schools."

Mr. McLennan then proceeds to explain that in Canada, Quebec and Newfoundland being excepted, fifteen per cent of the teachers receive less than $1,000 and they must supplement their earnings through some other activities, such as dish washing,

teaching in Sunday Schools, and supervising sports, dramatics and clubs for the young.

MR. MacLEOD: They do not get paid for teaching Sunday Schools, surely.

MR. CHARTRAND: Generally speaking, they are paid less than unskilled labour in industry and economically speaking they have sunk to the bottom of the population. Their professional status has degenerated to that of a public servant who must abide and surrender to all the whimsical idiosyncracies of the members of their community. And when the teachers retire after several years of faithful and devoted service they must be satisfied and contented with his pension which never exceed 60 to 65 per cent of their former salary.

In the face of such conditions and circumstances there is no reason to be unexpectedly and unduly alarmed by the shortage of teachers. At the present moment, there are thousands of able young men and women who would like to take up teaching but cannot bring themselves to enter a profession which condemns them to poverty, humiliation and low standards.

No ambitious man, in his right mind, is likely to embrace teaching as a lifework when he fully realizes that he commits his family to a life of social poverty. The scarcity of teachers has lead some person to recommend the lowering of their qualifications and standard in order to secure the proper enrolment. That, to my mind, would be a calamity of the first order and I suggest that we must not resort to this compromise and condone it while we are fully aware and appreciate thoroughly that the teaching of young children is one of the most important professions in the world and that a bad teacher can infect and a good teacher can inspire the minds of children in such a way that the whole course of the children's lives

may be changed.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Very truly.

MR. CHARTRAND: For the purpose of bringing order out of chaos in this whole situation, Mr. Speaker, for the shortage of teaching personnel, for the hardship of the teachers themselves, for the low standard within the profession, there is a single concrete remedy: we must care enough to pay them enough and restore them to their professional status.

Whenever one discusses matters of increased expenditures, the pertinent question is always: "Where shall the money come from?" Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the total costs of education from all sources in Ontario is in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000 and that the province is committed this year in the budget forecast to a contribution of about $56,000,000. We have been informed by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his Budget address that the province shall enjoy the $15,000,000 more revenue in the fiscal year than last year's forecast. This additional amount, we must admit, represents excessive taxation. It is the people's money and should be returned to the people as an atonement. For so doing, I know of no greater public, deserving cause than that of education.

There is also another province field of taxation which could be explored profetably. A few weeks ago while reading an address delivered in Toronto by Dr. Charlotte Whitton, I got the impression that the people of Ontario were prepared, willing and satisfied to gratify an unquenchable thirst at all costs. From the figures released, it would appear that in Canada we are spending over $600,000,000 on alcoholic beverage and that Ontario, as the banner province, took the lead with 38 per cent of the expenditures, amounting to about $250,000,000 and a per

capita consumption rate of over $50.00 per year.

I am not a professor of morals by any means and I do not consider this House as a temple in which to preach morals, but this kind of expenditure is surely a kind of luxury on a grand scale and the government of the day could safely levy an additional luxury tax forthe benefit of education without any fear as to the effect of the law of diminishing returns.

Lastly a contribution could and should be asked from the federal authorities. If my memory serves me right, the Premier of New Brunswick, the Hon. Mr. McNair, served notice on the delegates of the Dominion-Provincial Conference a few months ago, that he would bring up the matter of federal aid to education before agreeingto a re-allocation of the taxing powers between the two senior forms of government. I believe this is a splendid idea and should be followed up at the next sitting of the Dominion-Provincial Conference. After all, the federal authorities are already committed, by the Family Allowance, to the cause of the welfare of children, and they cannot in all fairness refuse now to contribute, if properly requested, to the primary education of these same children.

May I add that looking over a Gallup Poll survey made in February, 1948, on the financing of education, I was very much impressed by the answers given by students, parents, management, labour, real estate, clergy and politicians to the following question:

> "If more money is needed to improve schools and teaching standards, how do you think it should be raised?"

The summary of the answers was as follows:

> "Student and management groups favoured provincial financing, all others favoured federal aid."

The summary of free comments was as follows:

1. Very few respondents gave any reasons for seeking more local funds.
2. Many respondents wanted financing to come from all three levels of taxation, and some suggested that federal aid be spent through provincial and local administrations.
3. Those who favoured provincial financing felt that to be a more practical source of educational finance both for constitutional reasons, and because the educational systems are already set up on a provincial basis.
4. Supporters of federal financing of education felt generally:

   that education was a national problem;
   that the whole country benefitted from education;
   that national standardization and uniformity was desirable;
   that federal financing would equalize educational opportunities in different areas;
   that the federal government had greater taxing powers.

I have a strong feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the federal authorities are very sympathetic to the plan and if a proper demand was submitted for federal aid to education by the provincial delegates at the Dominion-Provincial Conference next autumn, a ready answer in the affirmative would greet their request.

As an indication of the prevailing state of mind of Canada's four major political parties, I would refer hon.

members of this House to an article which appeared in the Globe and Mail of March 28th, 1950, under the caption of "Four Parties endorse federal aid to education", wherein it is stated that, joining in a broadcast over CKSF, Cornwall, in a discussion of the question of whether the federal government should or should not bear a share of the costs of educating the country's youth, the principle of federal aid to education and the right of all Canadians to equal educational opportunities were endorsed by Transport Minister Lionel Chevrier, Conservative leader George Drew, Social Credit leader Solon Low and J. W. Noseworthy, C.C.F. M.P. for York South. That is very plain talk and the only sensible inference to be drawn from these pronouncements is that federal aid for education isthere for the asking. I strongly advocate and urge that we should avail ourselves of the opportunity at the earliest possible moment so that we may relieve municipalities and real estate from the crushing burden of taxation.

As I have pointed out before and emphasized many times previously I have great sympathy for the municipalities due to the tremendous burden of responsibilities thrust on their shoulders. It seems to me that under our present system of government, we enjoy a three-fold citizenship. We pay allegiance to our respective municipalities, we pay allegiance to our respective province and lastly, we pay allegiance to the Dominion as Canadian citizens. When this system of the three level form of governments was set up, I take it that the initiators had it in their mind that each form of government would be self-supporting and should not become financially sub-servient and kept into wardship by any senior government. Unfortunately today we have reached the stage in our days where the municipali-

ties are unable to cope adequately with the discharge of their duties. The homes of the people which are primary necessities, and even hovels, must submit to exorbitant taxation and still the revenues are insufficient. It is another case in point where a body politic is being assigned a certain set of responsibilities without adequate and corresponding taxing power. True enough, assistance is given to them by way of provincial hand outs and grants but so cluttered and fettered with rules and regulations as to infringe upon and conflict with their freedom of action. The municipalities are entitled to the fullness of their life within their own range of action free and unmolested from all kinds of interferences from senior government just as much as the provinces are entitled to their own autonomy. They do not want charitable hand outs or grants but taxing powers without limitations to real est ate or else a sharp limitation in their civic responsibilities. This problem can and should be very easily settled at the forthcoming Dominion-Provincial Conference by relieving the municipalities from all social services and by reducing drastically their share of the costs of education alongthe lines I have already indicated. This, to my way of thinking, is the only sensible policy to follow, unless of course, there should exist a desire to keep the municipalities in bondage forever, in which case the government should be prepared to assume the full responsibility for making a travesty and a mockery of local municipal autonomy.

I would like now to make afew comments on the Hope Commission on Education before bringing my remarks to a conclusion.

Strange as it may be, I believe I am getting reconciled with the Commissioners' delay in submitting their report. A few days before leaving Ottawa to attend my duties at this Session,

while enjoying the atmosphere of my best club, I started musing about the rock bottom cause of the undue delay by the members of this Commission to report their findings. Ithen recalled an anecdote with reference to an English judge and a young solicitor. It seemed that after listening to a long, tedious and monotonous summing up of the evidence and the arguments in favour of a culprit's innocence the sitting judge decided upon a recess and upon reaching his chambers he was heard to comment that "this young solicitor is not satisfied with unnecessarily taking up all the spare time of the Court, but he is further claiming the privilege of encroaching upon eternity".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we may all agree safely that the Commissioners have taken up all the unnecessary time up to this moment but if we care to think in terms of eternity, I surmise we may hold the key to this Chinese or jig-saw puzzle and the riddle begins to make sense. In the past century, a great author presented the world with a masterpiece entitled "A Take of Two Cities", which took several years in the making. Now we are expecting "A Take of Two Continents and of several States" and I have a feeling that in all fairness we should realize that it may well be a masterpiece of a lifetime in the making.

Since the inception of the task of gathering facts and knowledge, five former members of this House have passed to their just reward, a Parliament has come to an end, and we are now in the second Session of another Parliament. To date, the only contribution to our enlightenment, by this Commission, has been an interim report in the nature of a microscopic dust which

illustrates only too well the magnitude of the task at hand and the time required to bring it to complete fruition.

It must be said however, in the meantime that we the people of human remains, encompassed and limited within the scope and notion of time and of space, were very gratified and elated indeed over the initiative displayed by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) in his St. Thomas speech, delivered with the blessing of the hon Premier (Mr. Frost) of this province. In fact, we were given the outline as of a new policy in our lifetime, which was followed at this Session with a new orthodoxy in the distribution of provincial grants for education. We were further given assurance but last Friday that thisgovernment isnot going to stand still and wait for the report of theCommissioners. It intends to go ahead and run this province regardless of the Commission and its findings.

That is all to the good and as it should be, Mr. Speaker. No government should surrender its sovereign rights. We have not the slightest objection to any number of intellectuals who share no responsibility in this House keeping their minds in the air in quest of plans for some futuristic art, but we content a responsible party or parties must of necessity have their feet firmly entrenched in the ground. In this instance all the credit goes to our hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Premier of Ontario (Mr. Frost). We are indeed very fortunate to have them at the helm on this occasion. We can only hope and trust that with the assistance and co-operation of highly experienced, competent, far-sighted and constructive officials of the Department of Education, they may continue to give us guidance and sensible leadership in this field, all the while leaving the members of the Commission to toy with their problems for the full course of their natural

lives so that they may deliver their report in another world where it may shine in eternal glory, surrounded by an aura of sublimity, infinity and superfluity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHARTRAND: Needless to say at this juncture I shall cast my vote against the adoption of this budget and if the occasion arises I shall vote against the allotment of $50,000 to the members of the Hope Commission because I am afraid that it may lead to an infringement upon the rule of law against perpetuities and I have a natural inclination to be opposed to any unprincipled charitable gifts acts.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take F follows)

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in joining with other hon. members in addressing this Legislature on the question of the Budget, I would also like to extend to you my congratulations on the manner in which you have kept us all in our proper places.

I might say in my opening remarks, I would like to make reference to the northern tour which several of the hon. members of this Legislature made last September. I must say we missed you, Mr. Speaker, on the tour. However, we had with us another Reverend gentleman who participated in all the enjoyments and refreshments. I would also like to pass on some commendation to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) and particularly to his staff. I believe the conducted tour was one of educational value to a great number of us. As one coming from a very highly industrialized area in southern Ontario, going up through the northern part of the province, particularly in the section north of Lake Superior and visiting these giant corporations of pulp mills, lumber mills and steel mills, particularly that steel mill at Sault Ste. Marie, I believe most of the hon. members, particularly from the rural areas, were very interested in the Bessemer process of Algoma Steel. I do say it would have been a very nice gesture on the part of Algoma Steel to have had a representative of the employees at the lovely banquet we had at Sault Ste. Marie because I feel the workers in the industry are just as important to the industry as the employer, as we did find at Steep Rock when the president of the union was ---or one of the officers of the union was there. The employers there agreed, at least, to some extent, that the employees' representative should be there and meet with the hon. members of the Legislature. Then we left Algoma, Sault Ste. Marie and

went up through Marathon . . to the head of the lakes, I believe we have something there we can be justifiably proud of, natural resources, the big mills. When we reached the head of the lakes we went through the lumber mills at Port Arthur and Fort William and also went over and visited the granaries.

One rather peculiar incident did happen on the little boat trip we had from Fort William to Port Arthur; some of the hon. members in the delegation---I can tell you if you will look in the beautifully bound book, the album from the Department of Travel and Publicity which covers the trip, you will find a little bit of a card game going on. In this game, lo and behold, I had as a partner the Rev. gentleman representing Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer).

MR. MacLEOD: Not poker, I hope.

MR. DOWLING: No, we were playing euchre. In the opposition we had the hon.member for Middlesex South (Mr. Allen) and the other was the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Foster). I might say, there was a slight stipend on the side and we were getting very badly beaten. However, in reaching in my pocket for a cigarette, I happened to carry a rosary, and pulling it out, I shot it across the table to my partner. Well, the very fine gentleman (Mr. Downer) picked it up, held it in his hand for a moment, and shoved it back to me again. Then, what a miracle! He won the next six games without me. I feel quite confident if we cannot win hon. members from the other side of the House over to us politically, we might get them over here religiously. I might say in passing, he was a pretty good sport, he mixed with us very well and we did have a few more card games when we got on the train going back up to Sioux Lookout. One other inspiring thing on that

trip was when we left Kenora and travelled over to Dryden and there one of the officials of the Department of Lands and Forests made it possible for the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Stewart) and myself togo on a little fishing trip. Well, we did not catch any fish, but we did enjoy the hospitality of Mr. Jules up there who put on a lovely shore dinner for us. That also was arranged by the staff of the Department of Lands and Forests.

One of the things that impressed me particularly on this tour was, everywhere we stopped, they all wanted the Trans-Canada Highway, and speaking honestly and sincerely, I do believe if this highway is to go through the northern section of the province, in spite of what one or two hon. members on this side of the House may say, it is important that the highway go through the Sault and follow the northern shore of Lake Superior and through Kenora.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWLING: I think it is important and essential that the road be started through that area. We visited the Sault and saw the locks there and I understand there is more tonnage of material goes through those two locks in eight months of the year than the combined tonnage of the Suez and Panama Canals, in twelve months of the year.

On our return trip, coming back into the mining area, we more or less mixed very well together. I would like to pass a word of commendation for the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton). I think he conducted himself very well, he mixed with us, gave some verygood speeches, non-political of course, and it would not surprise me, having noticed he has moved down a little closer to the front benches, if he were there very soon.

Getting down to the mining area, we were then met by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and we enjoyed his hospitality. We had not any commercials sung to us up until that time about free enterprise but we certainly got them in Kirkland Lake and Timmins. We stayed and enjoyed the hospitality of these people putting these things on for us, praising free enterprise to the sky, and then went back to his private car, owned by the Ontario Northland Railways. However, I do think the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) served his department very well and his government because he made one statement and I am going to remind him of it today and I quite agree with it. He made the statement of "tolerance and understanding between labor and management, between employer and employee." If he has read the findings of the conciliation board in the mining area around McIntyre, the majority decision,--I hope you will send him up a telegram telling him about "tolerance and understanding," because I think you will agree with me that tolerance and understanding certainly has not done very much for the attitude of the mine operators in that area in view of the conciliation that has gone on.

That brings me around to organized labor. On the trip through northern Ontario the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), when it was announced about five or six days ago of the possibility of a new leader of the Liberal Government, we found out the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) was going to throw his hat in the ring, and I hope he does throw his hat into the ring. I would assure him, however, he had better learn more of organized labor than he knows now if he wants to win the leadership. Here is a statement he made on March 16th:

"There is a disposition to discriminate between men and if one man carries a union card they have been stamped, picketed, catalogued, and that is all there is to it."

I would like to review for a moment because I happen to come from a very industrialized riding, I believe it is the largest in the province, Hamilton East. We have steel mills larger than Algoma, we have farm implement plants, mills, factories, and most of them are highly organized. In the Steel Workers Union, during the war years, we participated in an all-out effort, organized as we were, even on the basis of having our men come out and supply blood so plasma could be supplied to the boys overseas. After the war was over that was discontinued, but the steel workers in Hamilton through their area council---I happen to be a representative of that council ---organized themselves again in one steel workers area, and we set up our own blood bank in both hospitals, including the blood bank of the General Hospital in the city of Hamilton. Out of some 27 blood banks there were more people went to that blood bank than in any other in the hospital, and the same went for St. Josephs Hospital and that blood was not just for steel workers or members, we gave complete authority to the hospitals that that blood could be used for anyone desiring it, particularly ward patients. That is the only way our members were indexed and catalogued, because we needed that index to see what type of blood they had.

Earlier on in the day, one of the hon. members of the union from Hamilton was sitting in the galleries here. He is one of those individuals who has a rare type of blood.

There was a call from Kirkland Lake for this type of blood and they could not get the patient to Toronto. He was prepared, at his own cost and loss of time, to replenish the blood of that person who required it. In that regard, I might say we have the cooperation of a few industrialists in Hamilton. The president of the Frosst Company gave us permission to have the workers go out of the plant during working hours to give their blood. And the wire company gave us permission to have the men out during working hours. The Steel Company turned us down, the Harvester turned us down, but in the case of International Harvester, the Steel Workers Union paid out of their own funds for the men to go up there and donate their blood. It was only a few short months ago that the Red Cross came to us and said they wanted to set up a blood bank in Hamilton that would be open 24 hours a day and asked our cooperation. They realized we have the largest blood banks in Hamilton and we agreed to do so. They went to the extent of putting one of the members of our committee from the Steel Company of Canada on their Board of Directors. Very few people knew about this until it was highlighted one night on the national hookup of the C. B. C. called "Steel Workers in Hamilton, organized labor, a section of." There was no other place for people to secure blood because if they did they had to pay $25.00 for blood, for plasma.

Another thing labor has done for Hamilton is to get people queuing up for street cars and buses, in spite of the fact that the Junior Chamber of Commerce claim credit for it, we were the ones to do it. We have organized Workmen's Compensation committees in large plants. Twenty-two plants in

Hamilton were represented about two weeks ago at a so-called workers' class when representatives from these various plants took a day off fromwork and we had the services of Walter Johnston of the Workmen's Compensation Board who came down as a teacher and spent half a day with us. There were 72 in attendance at the compensation class. We discussed every aspect of the compensation and after it was over, the balance of the day was, taken up in another class on Unemployment Insurance and we had a representative of the Unemployment Insurance there. And we did not catalogue them or index them at all. We had another day off fromwork and there was over 200 workers at the steel mills in Hamilton discussing safety. For this meeting we even brought our own representative fromPittsburgh from the union. And they discussed various aspects of safety in industry, and we are asking employers today to recognize our committees appointed by the union. We also have picnics and entertainment in the summertime. I believe we had the largest picnic ever held in La Salle Park at Hamilton last summer when over 5000 were in attendance. We also have Christmas trees, parties in the winter time, not just for members of the steel workers and their families. Last Winter one group went to the extent of telling the Welfare Department of the city of Hamilton that they were prepared to adopt several families and see they got Christmas gifts and Christmas dinner. And arrangements were made. As a part of organized labor we have a welfare setup where we can look after people where men have been laid off and we try our best to get them employment and where we find it is not available, and Unemployment Insurance is not possible, some of the organized

labor unions in Hamilton get together and do something about it. We have a recreation committee and we sponsor our own social events. Certainly I think this is all part of organized labor and I think it will lead people to think not of P. A. L. but of C. C. F., because the reason why the C. C. F. and organized labor are working together is because the C. C. F. is the only party that has agreed to go along the line with resolutions based on organized labor findings. Your party would not do it, the government would not do it.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labor): What have you accomplished by it?

MR. DOWLING: Perhaps not very much.

MR. SCOTT: Look at the record.

MR. DOWLING: I used to be an hon. member of your party and I went out to the last election and defeated the hon. member for Hamilton East in one of the industrial parts of Ontario.

I would like to say, especially to some hon. members of the House from rural ridings, the largest union we have in Hamilton is at the Steel Company of Canada and it may seem rather odd that the president of that company for several years was a farmer. He had a small dairy farm. We also have members in the fruit farmers in the Niagara district and we try to have a close relationship between the farmer and labor. Last weekend we had a class in McMaster University and we had farm representatives there who came to our two-day class and it is rather peculiar that the last labor council meeting held in the city of Hamilton was attended by a farmer from one of the farmer organizations, so, farmers and labor are working together, and it is only proper that they should do so. It is rather peculiar also, in regard to this

question of union security---I think the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) will make his contention---I do not believe in the last two or three years we have ever had a case that went to conciliation that was not covering some measure of union security. The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) is a lawyer, a member of an exclusive society. It would be rather interesting to find out if he supports the check-off that organized labor has asked for. When a worker from the Province of Quebec, organized into the Canadian Congress of Labor, comes to Hamilton for employment, he is not even asked to pay an iniation fee, as long as he pays the current dues. However, if a lawyer comes into the Province of Ontario from the Province of Quebec to practise, I believe he has to pay $1500, in fact, I believe the Law Society of Upper Canada charges students before they are evencalled to the bar. I do not think he will find that--

MR. DALEY: Could I ask you just one question? In this question of union security where you said that all your classes have secured that, was there ever a case where you failed to secure it in negotiation?

MR. DOWLING: Well, I am talking about union security on the basis of the check-off.

MR. DALEY: Yes, but was there ever one case where in your negotiations for an agreement . . . you failed to get some measure of union security?

MR. DOWLING: Not in the last two years, no. I might say we have not negotiated union shop contracts in Hamilton.

Now, one condition with regard to organized labor today is the question of the 40-hour week. We have a large number of unemployed in Hamilton as factory business

has kind of slackened off and we have several foundries in Hamilton. These foundries make farm machinery and implements and some have been operating on a 40-hour week in the last few months. We have negotiated contracts with most of the employers in my jurisdiction and they have agreed to go from the 45-hour to 40-hour without any loss of take-home pay; in other words, from a 9-hour day to an 8-hour day. Just to give you an illustration, one of the plants at Hamilton which is making a contribution to hydro,-- they manufacture hinges and in this plant we have never had to go to concilitation, we have always been successful in negotiating our contract even before the old one expired. In this particular plant they reduced the hours from 45 to 40 but as a result of it the company found itself in the position of putting on another shift. It required 16 new employees, and they said to us: "Can you give us 16 new employees?" We keep a record in our office of the steel workers who are unemployed and we sent them down 16 new employees. Some of them are female workers. We tried to get permission to get this second shift in operation by working at night. They turned us down. However, I do not remember seeing anyone from the Department of Labor in Hamilton in 1948 stopping the Steel Company of Canada fromoperating 24 hours a day for three months. We have cooperated with this company and I must say that it is a company that it is a pleasure to go in and negotiate with because, as was said by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), they have tolerance and understanding the same as we have.

If I might develop, just for a moment, that question of the 40-hour week, in the case I have just mentioned, it gave these 16 men employment and if it was possible for the

steel industry in Hamilton to go along on the 40-hour basis, it would take up all the employment in the city of Hamilton. There are many people walking the streets in Hamilton today looking for work.

(Take G follows)

You know, there is a rather amazing story told about the participation of organized labor, and union members particularly and in this case the officer of one of the unions, who kept on telling his wife, I suppose: "I have got a union meeting tonight, I have got to go out." Every day the same thing happened and finally she asked him who were the other people going to the union meeting. "Oh, all the other officers. They are negotiating for a new contract." The wife began to get a little suspicious that he was using his union badge as a means of getting out at night, so she called up the wife of one of the other officers allegedly having this meeting and wanted to know if her husband was out. The lady said: "Yes," at which the first lady said: "What do you say we go down to where this meeting is being held and see what it is all about?" So that night when her husband came home from work, he said: "Well, I've got a union meeting tonight," and out he goes and the women all get together, go to the meeting and walk in, and, sure enough, there are their respective husbands all sitting around the table. The women had a spokeswoman, who said: "Well, we came down to help you out. We understand you want the 8-hour day." They said: "Yes, that is what we are contracting for now, we are going to tell the employer we want an 8-hour day." The wives said: "Fine, we are right behind you. We want an 8-hour day too." Well, the men all looked at each other dumfounded and finally one fellow turned to his wife and said: "Marie, do you want an 8-hour day?" She said: "I certainly do." He said: "I'll give you the 8-hour day, but I warn you, the day it starts, I am putting on a second shift."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DOWLING: I also would like to make reference parti-

cularly to my hon. friend for London (Mr. Calder) here with regard to what organized labor is doing.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): He is after you, Cam.

MR. DOWLING: I have here the March edition of The Canadian Unionist, which is the official publication of the Canadian Congress of Labor. On page 53 there are three items that show what organized labor is doing. One is with regard to the appeal of the Canadian Red Cross on the UNICEF issue of the United Nations, the International Children's Emergency Fund, and in the last paragraph it says:

> "Also under way at this time is the campaign being carried on for the benefit of crippled children. Service clubs in Ontario and other provinces are distributing Easter seals by mail and the amounts raised in this way are devoted to the care and treatment of crippled children where such assistance would not otherwise be available.
>
> "All these organizations depend for their success on the willingness of the people of Canada to contribute toward their operation. The workers will undoubtedly assume their full obligation in this regard."

Another item at the bottom of the page is "Ending the means test," appealing to the various governments through the elected representatives in the unions to abolish the means test.

On another page is a memo---you can see it from over there---"Support the Red Cross," appealing to the members of organized labor. And at the bottom is a statement under "Labor-Management Committees"; that was brought about during

the war where the government itself asked management and labor to get together to set up management-labor committees, production committees and an all-out prosecution of the war.

I hope the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) will get a copy of this and read it, and he will find that organized labor is not just an index and catalogue, it is a growing organization and will continue to grow, not only on the basis of looking after economic conditions of working conditions in industry, but also in things of a community nature. I know several members right in Hamilton today, I served for four years on the Playground Commission, the Recreation Council, and we do give a lot of time in that respect.

I would like to repeat further with regard to labour, my appeal to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) the other day about enlarging his conciliation staff. Right at the present time there are three conciliation boards going on, or in the process, in the city of Hamilton, which require three of the hon. minister's (Mr. Daley) staff. I believe that leaves him with four or five. I hope he will find conciliation officers who are quite competent enough to step into the breach without having to wait a few weeks before they show up, and who will not, after they have met with us once or twice say, "Well, I have got to go here, I have got to go there". Certainly I hope the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) will find ways and means of improving and enlarging his conciliation branch.

In the same regard, I trust that certain men who go out from certain branches of your department, the health and factory inspectors, when they go into a plant on the request of the union will talk to the union officer. I believe I brought an illustration of that to hon. members of the Legislature

the other day with regard to the Department of Health, and of how Dr. Cunningham had sent Dr. Wilson into the International Harvester Company. I feel it is only fair to point that out, it shows organized labour is prepared to work with their department if given the opportunity to do so.

The investigators from the Workmen's Compensation Board do meet, they have come into my office many a time before they have gone down to the plant to investigate locally any claim that has perhaps been turned down in its original form by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

One other thing that makes it rather difficult for organized labour is the affect of your one week vacation with pay after one year. We sign contracts with employers and sometimes those contracts provide for two week's holidays after three years, sometimes after two years, and in some cases -- it has happened in Hamilton and it has happened elsewhere, -- plants shut down for two weeks, and the employee is only entitled to one week. What have we got? We have got a lock out. That is what it is, the employee is locked out, paid for one week, during the other week he does not qualify for unemployment insurance, and yet he is on the basis of getting one week's pay while the plant shuts down for two weeks.

I think it is very important, if the Bill is called this Session, that we get the two weeks. Certainly two weeks is not too much to ask an employer today to pay employees as a minimum for working, in the steel industry, particularly. You can not do it by a light sweat -- and it is in your Bible the same as in mine that you have to earn your bread by it -- working 48 hours a week in a steel mill; I have worked in it, conditions down there have been speeded up during the war process, and they still believe men can keep up that pace. If they

have to maintain that pace, they must have at least two weeks after two years' service.

That reminds me of a story of a union member who kept going out to union meetings and finally his wife got sick and tired of it and when he came back from a meeting she asked him what they were talking about. He said, "We are talking about the strike". She shut the door and locked it and said, "You can get back in your car and go back to the meeting and talk about the lockout." That is what it is, a lockout for one week for those employees who do not qualify for two weeks' vacation.

With regard to Hamilton itself, and I am glad the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is here -- I might say that a little louder and get his attention -- on the question of access to the mountain area at Hamilton, I believe last year it was mentioned in the House that you would agree to go some way towards installation or construction of a tunnel to eliminate that terrific bottleneck up on Hamilton mountain. We do have a mountain over there, for the benefit of some hon. members, and we feel rather proud, it is a growing community; someone remarked here Wednesday when I was talking of it out in the hall about what a terrifically big mountain it was, but I feel if that hon. member had instructed the city street-cleaning department to keep the streets in his town as clean as we do in Hamilton, he would have a mountain, too.

However, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) did indicate -- and I believe will agree -- that he is prepared to go at least one-third of the way towards the cost of a tunnel if it is constructed. Is that correct, Mr. Minister (Mr. Doucett)?

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Do you want me to answer that?

MR. DOWLING: Yes.

MR. DOUCETT: Well, of course this government, as you know, are paying subsidies to all municipalities in the province of Ontario. Last year we passed an Act in this Legislature which permits cities to get 33 1/3 cent of their street and road expenditure -- approved expenditure.

MR. DOWLING: Well, I am very glad to hear that. I feel now that perhaps if we can go to the federal government and get an additional amount, we may be able to eliminate the rather unfortunate condition with regard to getting up and down and the mountain.

Also last year I moved a Bill in the House, with regard to fumes control. I do believe we withdrew that on the basis the municipalities would be granted permission to pass a by-law to help control that condition. We feel that condition still is present in Hamilton. It has not been quite eliminated, although I believe we shocked the hon. Minister of Mines at that time, who happens to be the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost); when we went into committee, there was a whole "gang" down from Sudbury at that particular time, and he thought we were discussing the Sudbury condition, while it happened to be a Hamilton condition, and I feel that with the co-operation of the municipality and the government we may be able to do something towards that.

There is one final thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, and I am sorry the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) are not in their seats. Last year we read the "pleasant" headlines about the Mattawa situation, about the

epidemic in Mattawa. Well, I went up to Mattawa right when this condition was in existence, and I say it is a disgrace on both papers in the city of Toronto for what they did.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWLING: I say that because I spent a whole day in the area, I talked to the merchants, I talked to the man who opened the theatre just the day previous, I went up to La Cave and looked at the Hydro development. I could not find the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) who, I understand, was supposed to be looking after the interest of his constituents but I say in all sincerity -- and I reported this to the hon. Leader of our group (Mr. Jolliffe) -- that you have done a terrible dis-service to the community of Mattawa in the terrible headlines here. You could not find an American tourist within 25 miles of Mattawa all during last summer, and I spent some time up in that area. The merchants were terribly disappointed in what the Toronto Star, and, yes, some of the other Toronto papers have done, because you could not get anyone to go near the place. It is a beautiful little town in the Ottawa valley and its people depend considerably upon the tourist trade in order to carry on its affairs.

I am rather sorry the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) did not discuss that more fully. I think he did mention it, setting up this corporation that will make it possible for these communities to take care of their sewerage service, and so on, which allegedly caused the epidemic. Certainly I believe the people in Mattawa have learned an awful lot about the political aspects of certain newspapers, and it is only fair to say that these people have had an injustice done to them, and I hope this corporation that has been set up will make it possible for them to go ahead and remedy

that condition.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like again to re-emphasize the question of the expenditure of money, that re-consideration be given to the highway to go to the head of the lakes from Sault Ste. Marie up through that area. I have no axe to grind, but I think it is rather unfortunate that one of the large lumber mills that was mentioned here previously by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is closing down, and at the same time I read in the press where a new lumber mill is starting up in some part of southern Ontario. While I was in that area I did go over and have a look at a brand-new lumber mill that was started, I believe it is owned by one of the Conservative members in the House of Commons, Mr. Earl Rowe. You never saw such a make-shift organization in your life, sawdust scattered all over the street, no roof on the buildings, talk about pulling logs up a skidway for lumber -- some of those "logs" were not any more than three inches across, and yet we find this giant lumber mill going down. I hope the government can find some way of resolving these issues in disputes between the timber and sulphite men, so that the whole industry can go ahead, and the great resources up there can be utilized.

Further, I hope the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will give earnest consideration when drafting his estimates again, to make sure there is sufficient in there to take care of increase applications, because organized labour is still going ahead, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley), we are going to continue to grow and you are going to have more requests to meet by your department from organized labour for conciliation officers, inspectors, workmen's compensation, and what have you.

I might say I have handled more workmen's compensation cases perhaps than anybody in this Legislature. I believe I have handled some 200 to 300 cases the last 12 months. Just the other day I was up to the Board and am going again on Wednesday, and I found when I called them up about a case, they even have a file with my name on it now. However, I feel they are doing a tremendous job. It might supprise hon. members of the House to learn there are 11,000 pieces of mail which go through the Workmen's Compensation Board every day, so you can realize the amount of work that is being carried on.

However, I feel that with the improved workmen's compensation, with improved conciliation officers, and being able to have such available when requested, organized labour is only too willing to co-operate with your department.

May I close by saying I also appreciate the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) when the delegation from the Ontario Federal of Labour met with him, in expressing the very potent fact that the door was not open just once a year when the delegation came; it would be open at all times when any officers of the Ontario Federation of Labour come in to discuss labour conditions with him. I think that is a fine gesture, and I am quite safe in saying you had better have your door open quite frequently, because they are going to come in from all over the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few and very brief comments in the closing hours of this Budget Debate, and in the last week of the Legislature, I hope, of this Session, I would like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer and Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)

on his presentation of the Budget. It has been suggested that it is his "swan song" as Provincial Treasurer; if such, he sang a fairly attractive song indeed, and I think will go down in history as one of the good treasurers of the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Certainly he has handled this important office in a manner which has evidently been acceptable to the people, and to me, as a financial critic, he has faced the difficult problems of the problems before this Legislature in as capable a manner as they could be faced, always of course making the best face of it that he could for the government that he represents as Provincial Treasurer.

MR. A. A. Mac LEOD (Bellwoods): This is the pay-off for the $40 million.

MR. NIXON: He mentioned in particular that this was his eighth Budget address, and came very close to the record set in this province by his predecessors, so that evidently when the Budget is next presented to this House, someone else will hold that important position.

Now, if the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has not the record in numbers of Budgets presented he certainly, I think, has the record in the size of Budgets that he has presented and the amounts of money that he has collected from the long-suffering taxpayers in the province of Ontario.

Before going into some discussion of the Budget, I would like to express also my approval to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in this, his first session in that capacity, on calling this House together in the middle of February, and conducting the business so that it is shaping up to a close, I hope on Wednesday or Thursday of this week.

I have no particular complaints to make on that score. I did complain very frequently and as strongly as possible when in the days of his predecessor, Mr. Drew, the Session was called in March and frequently ended well on in April.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a fellow-farmer, you will know how necessary it is for us on the land to get the good seed in the ground at the proper time, and I think the government deserves our approval in calling this session in the middle of February, but I do suggest that we have during this last week been under a pressure to wind up the important business of this House, by next Thursday, that is quite unnecessary, that should not be the case in dealing with the hundreds of millions of dollars in the Estimates, and in the Budget and the other important matters that are before this House. I know the government will say: "Well, we are here, if hon. members want to sit after Easter, O.K. with us", but the fact remains there is the pressure to wind up, and that I think could be avoided entirely if the government would next year seek to call this House together, say towards the 1st of February, and then if we are through before Easter, it is quite O.K. and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it will be even O.K. if we are not here on my birthday, on the 1st of April. This was the first year in some time that I have had the pleasure of spending it in the bosom of my family, and I assure you it was an even much more happy experience than spending it here with my good friends, the hon. members of the House.

I will leave that thought with the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and hope that he will give it consideration in calling the House next Session.

I know that he came into this House this year with the

intention of smiling his way through every circumstance, but when the pressure of moving business along became so great, he lost even that very charming smile which has taken him through so many difficult situations and brought him up to the position, I think, that he holds today, and we had him on more than one occasion perilously near to that of another stateman in a different field, who, when under pressure, said there would hot be one five-cent piece from the federal treasury to any province that had a Tory government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: And in dealing with my friend, the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor) the other night, when the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was seeking to press his Estimates through, he suggested that he, the hon.member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor) had drawn so many "red herrings" across the trail, in which he meant of course, because of his opposition, that when it came to giving anything

to his particular town of Cobalt, he did not care whether or not they got anything -- something to that effect. It was very close, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to that famous five-cent speech which did so much to cause the Right Honourable Mr. King the loss of the 1930 election. I know that on further consideration you did not mean that to be taken quite as literally as it sounded at the moment.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): But it will be just as useful at the next election.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affiars): You will need more than that.

MR. NIXON: Notwithstanding the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) very pleasure tenure in office, I submit that he has been the child of good fortune, which has favoured

Ontario, as well as the rest of Canada, due in some small measure, of course to the sound federal policies under a Liberal government which have benefited this province under a Tory government, as it has other provinces throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: And Ontario is not alone in having had favourable Budgets during these last few years. It was not many years ago when the province of Alberta was repudiating their debt, and now we find they are paying off their debt faster than any other province in Canada, are enjoying the greatest of prosperity, and undoubtedly will be the first province, if any province ever does reach that enviable position, of having no debt.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): But Ottawa did not give them their oil.

MR. NIXON: Well, Providence gave them their natural resources, as they did the province of Ontario. I think Alberta is making a fairly good job of exploiting its resourdes, and seeing to it that the Treasury of that province gets its fair share from those natural resources, and I am not altogether certain that the Treasury of Ontario is getting all to which it is entitled from the exploitation of some of the natural resources of this province.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) found himself, when he came into office, with a fine surplus at hand, a very well-staffed provincial treasury, and many "melons" which he was able to cut in subsequent years and distribute, which were left to him by the preceding government, of which I had been a member.

And to contrast conditions which we faced when we came in after the previous Conservative government, in 1934, we faced then a deficit of $30 million and expenditures that had been made for relief capitalized, so that the auditor had to write off that system of book-keeping against surplusses, even up to a few years ago. Had the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) faced into any such situation as that, he certainly could not have boasted here, as he did on the 17th, that in every Budget he had presented a balanced Budget and a surplus.

The expenditures in 1943, when he took office, were in the neighbourhood of $100 million. Now they are to be this year for which we are voting Estimates, some three hundred and fifty-three millions of dollars -- three hundred and fifty-three and a half, according to the summary, to be voted $215 million and statutory, $138 million -- and there is to be enough revenue collected in taxation to meet this colossal expenditure and still show a surplus. So that the expenditures of the province, Mr. Speaker, have been mounting in an alarming manner. I know that some of my hon. friends do not agree with this, but to me it does seem that an expenditure of three hundred and fifty-three and a half millions of dollars is certainly getting into a very sizeable sum indeed.

This has been a 300 per cent increase since my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) assumed office, and if it continues under his successors, whoever they may be, in another seven years the expenditures in this province will be one billion dollars a year .

The hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) again this year maintains the very unenviable record of being the world's worst forecaster when it comes to Budget estimation. Here again, as

previously, the Liquor Estimate was thirty-two millions of dollars and the Budget report of 10 months actual and 2 months estimated some thirty-seven and a half million, an increase of five and a half millions there, and it would be interesting to note how much money the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) this year left in the till of the Liquor Commission, because we find that last year, according to the auditor's report, there was six and a half million dollars that was due to the Treasury of the province which was not taken in because the government evidently on that day did not need the money, and I wonder if that six and a half millions is still down there with the Liquor Board, and maybe another two or three million in addition;

(Take H follows)

and then in corporation, an estimated $56½ million; the actual 10 months, with 2 months estimated this year, $65 million, or an increase of $8½ million. In gasoline, $52½ million that is 57.6, an increase of 5.1 million, or an increase in these three items alone of more than $19 million.

But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is not much to be gained -- very little indeed -- in taking up the time of this House to discuss these estimates, even for the revenue of the year which just ended four days' ago, because they are 10 months actual, and 2 months estimated, and the record shows that the hon. Treausrer (Mr. Frost) is even poorer at guessing for the two months, than he is for 12 months, because if you turn to the auditor's report, on page 11, it shows the previous year's record, when all the facts were before the auditor, a difference between the actual 10 months and estimated 2 months, and what actually was received by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was $9½ million, which, computed on the basis of 12 months instead of 2, would have been an error of some $54 million. So that the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) when estimating the revenues for 2 months, is even worse proportionately than for 12 months.

Now, notwithstanding the tremendous revenues which have come to the treasury during the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) term in office, it does seem that his appetite for more money is simply insatiable, Although he has predicted a balanced Budget, and a slight surplus for another year, he is going out after more and more money. We are to have certain further applications of the Amusement Tax, and increase in the tax on pari-mutuel betting; there will undoubtedly be a very considerable increase in the taxes on commercial sports on Sunday, and then we have this new income tax, shortly

before the House, Mr. Speaker, from which he hopes to get some $13 million or $15 million from the federal treasury, because if you do not take it, it will go into the federal treasury, as it did in previous years, and this year the hon. Finance Minister of Canada (Mr.Abbott) budgeted for only $20 million surplus. I do not know whether the $20 million includes this $15 million which the hon. Provincial Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Frost) hoped to get -- I do not know whether that is very definitely stated, but in any case, we are going after the provincial income tax. Of course, there is the tax on logging operations, and I might even mention again the $10 tax they are going to collect from those who get married by a magistrate or a judge, under the new Marriage Act, So you will see there is no limit. This ranges from amounts running into many, many millions of dollars, down to a $10 tax for those believers or unbelievers, which this hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is after, in his insatiable pursuit of more and more money from the taxpayers of the province.

The government has a most flexible system, here, as well as elsewhere, in presenting its Budget, as far as capital and ordinary expenditures are concerned, and as far as surplusses acknowledged are concerned.

Some years ago the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was boasting of a surplus of $25 million. So bad was the public reaction to that announced Budget surplus, that I think he made up his mind very definitely that never again would he present a surplus of $25 million. Certainly he has never done so since, although the amounts received and expended would justify a statement of that $25 million surplus just as conclusively as it did at that time.

But he has since chosen to claim a surplus of about a million dollars -- $100,000 one way or the other -- and is

paying all the rest into the sinking fund for the retirement of the debt.

I am the last one in the world to quarrel with him when it comes to retiring debts in the prov nce of Ontario, or his own personal affairs, e r. But it is the flexible way in which he deals with these surplusses, and I think they should be acknowledged as surplusses, when they are so, and then have the surplusses applied to the reduction of debt, and not to say that $20 million has been applied to the reduction of debt, and then say, "Which leaves us one million dollars". Why not say you have got now some billions of surplus, and you apply the $21 million to debt reduction, because it is the same thing in the end. That $1,100,000. is not arrived at by any system of book-keeping, but it is an arbitrary sum, taken by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) as a surplus, and then, after he acknowledges it as a surplus, he applies it to the reduction of the debt.

Here again it is only when we come to the auditor's report that we can get any idea of what the surplusses are.

On page 19, in connection with the year which was closed a year ago, the surplus account is $111 million, and it says:

> "The surplus account has increased during the year by $24,392,000. Totals of the changes in surplus during the year are shown in the public accounts, on page 8."

There fore, I will not take the time to refer to them other than that. But, according to the auditor's statement of surplus accounts, last year it increased by the sum of $3,292,000. and we must wait until we get the auditor's report tabled in this House next session to know what our actual surplus is,

because we cannot get it from the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) budget statement.

Now, according to that statement, Mr. Speaker, there are certain highlights he rather failed to stress. In spite of the tremendous volume of income which he acknowledged, the increase in the gross debt, according to his statement on page 26, was $69½ million, and the net debt, as shown on page 27, was $37 million, an increase in net debt, and the funded debt (see page 28) of more than $50 million.

I have seen the time in this House when, if any hon. Treasurer attempted such a statement as that in his finances, we would have been led to believe that we were on the high road to bankruptcy.

Then there is another feature as well, which I wish to draw to the attention of the government in greater detail, and that is in regard to contingent liabilities.

Here, in 1947, the province had a guaranteed debt, contingent liabilities, of $116½ million. In 1949, it was $259 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is according to a statement on page 29; this year, according to that statement, that debt which in 1947 -- three short years ago -- was $116 million, is $401 million. It does seem to me that with an increase of such rapid growth, it should make even this government pause to consider where we are going, in the matter of guaranteed debt.

This, Mr. Speaker, was the hon. provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) who said that he had long ago learned, down in Lindsay, to back nobody's note, and never has done that.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has backed notes for increase from $47,000,000., to the amount of this last statement I have just finished referring to, until it

amounts to $401,000,000., an increase from $116,000,000. But the end is not yet by any means, because while the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) does not give us an estimate of the increases they have guaranteed, I understand the Hydro alone will be spending $162,000,000. approximately, and that will have to be added onto the increases. So when we face you next year, Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed debt of this province will be over one-half billion dollars, and never before, until very recent years, has it been up to more than about $150,000,000.

This has become an alarming indication of the trend of the guaranteed debt structure of this province, and we are getting tied up with such a terrific load of guaranteed debt. Sometimes, Mr.Speaker, when you put your name on the back of a note, you have to pay it. We have had to do it before in this province,particularly in connection with the Hydro Electric Railway down in the Windsor district, about which you, Mr. Speaker, may know more than I. But I know we were assured by Sir Adam Beck that never would we have to pay one cent of the cost of these debentures, but the name of the Hydro Power Commission of Ontario was on those debentures at one time, and how they ever slid out without paying, is beyond my knowledge.

So, I do, in all seriousness, bring to the attention of the House the fact that thereshould be some very careful supervision in connection with the Hydro expenditures. I had intended to go into that in some detail. We have here the Hydro Commission, and I agree they can get things done, and can usually spend the money, and we might again face a situation where you have more power developed at high prices than the public of this province will buy.

I went through that situation -- as did some of the hon. members opposite -- in 1934, and even when we had hundreds of thousands of horsepower, we were selling it for $2.25, for the development of steam power in this province, and the surpluses

of the Hydro Commission melted away like the snows in April, and the cost of power mounted so rapidly, that they would have preferred to use cheaper power. The government of the day, of which I was a member, dealt with that situation in a very drastic way, and I can assure the hon. members opposite that it was no more pleasant to do it then, than it would be to the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) today. But we jerked this situation up by its bootstraps until we cheapened the price of power, and the corporations increased their use of power, and it was only a few years until the Hydro was back on a sound actuarial basis.

The hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) has referred to the cancellation of these power contracts. If he wants to destroy them, I am sure that the electric people of Quebec would like to have them restored on the same terms, and, of course, the blocs of power would have to be paid for in American funds. I do not think any hon. member would want that condition restored -- the restoration of these contracts.

Mr. Speaker, it always seems the time flies much faster than I expected it would. I wanted to make a few comments on education, before I concluded my remarks, and to point out that this year in the Estimates I do not see any mention of a salary for a Minister of Education, and I wonder if that is deliberate or not, because I was certainly under the impression-- I may say the hope and expectation-that we were going to have a full-time Minister of Education, and I read with much interest certain reported statements by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) when he took office in April and May, concerning his views with respect to a Minister of Education.

I note in the Toronto Evening Telegram of May 4th the following:

> "Premier Frost said he had picked a man to be Minister of Education, but it would take him a

little time to wind up his personal affairs".

You were not in the chair when I commenced my remarks this afternoon, Mr.Speaker; I did want to extend to you my very warm personal regards and admiration for your continued splendid discharge of the duties of your office, and it may be just as well that I got those few comments off, before I refer to you, because I may be led out of the House very shortly. This goes on:

"It is almost certain that the man to take this post will be Reverend M. C. Davies, Windsor, present Speaker of the Legislature."

In the Globe of June 15th, we see this:

"Davies, Hamilton seen Accepting Posts in Cabinet", and it goes on to say:

"Conditions which prevented Rev. M. C.(Dave) Davies, Windsor and W.E.(Bill)Hamilton, Guelph, from accepting Ontario cabinet posts when the new government under Premier Frost assumed office have been overcome and their appointment is expected momentarily.

"Mr.Davies is slated for the Education port'olio, and Mr. Hamilton for reform institutions. Attorney-General Dana Porter is acting Minister of Education and Municipal Affairs Minister George Dunbar has been carrying on as Minister of Reform Institutions, a department ho has capably administered since it was set up some years ago.

"Speaker of the Legislature, Mr. Davies is rector of St. George's Anglican Church, Walkerville. Because of his obligations to his parishioners, it was impossible for him to accept immediately the invitation to enter the Cabinet. It is understood arrangements have been completed to give him assistance

in looking after his Parish".

Whether or not this would be of any interest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I may say that that suggestion that our worthy hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Hon. Mr. Davies) should be Minister of Education met with the very greatest and most enthusiastic support of the member for Brant, and it has been a great disappointment to me that it has not come through.

One of the hon. members received applause the other day when he said he was glad you had not resigned to accept the post of Minister of Education. Maybe I will be led out of the House when I say I am extremely sorry you didnot resign to become Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario because I honestly think -- and I am absolutely sincere in stating -- that this province needs a full-time Minister of Education.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: I think that you, Mr. Speaker, have shown a capacity for decisions and the ability and the training which would fit you most excellently to discharge those most important duties.

I do not want to have it felt that I am in any way reflecting upon the present hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) for whom I have a very high personal regard. He has always treated me with the greatest consideration. But the fact remains that he has on his hands now one of the heaviest portfolios in the government, that of Attorney-General, and if he continues indefinitely to discharge the responsibility of both of these Departments, my warning to you would be that you will be "overworking the willing horse", and you may not have either a Minister of Education or an Attorney-General.

I think all hon. members will agree with me that it was the extremely heavy work in the Department of the Attorney-General

which so seriously affected the health of our good friend, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) -- the former Attorney-General.

Far from these comments reflecting on the hon. Attorney-General and Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), when he stands up in this House -- as he so frequently does -- and deals in one moment with the Department of Education and the next moment with Bills from the Attorney-General Department, and then on legal matters as the authority for the entire scope of government, I am reminded of an old verse, with which I am almost tempted to agree:

"And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
"That one small head could carry all he knew."

I do say that the educational affairs of this province need the attention of a full-time Minister, and I hope the government has not abandoned this thought altogether, and for that reason, left the vote out of the Estimates.

(Page H-10 follows)

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the vast sums of money which are spent for education in this province, it is more a matter of contention and dissatisfaction today than I have ever known it to be. It is true, in the past we did not vote anything like the sums of money in grants and so on, but at least there was some consistency. The people knew what they were getting, and there was not the contention and the criticism over thes matters which exist in this House, and throughout the province at the present time. While I have great respect for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) I do submit that his approach to some of the problems are rather of a "slap-happy" nature, I noticed in the report of an address he delivered to the Board of Trade Club a few days ago, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) said:

> "In recent years Ontario secondary schools have been turning out students who can act in plays, cheer at foot-ball games, but cannot write or spell properly, and read nothing but crime comics".

Do you approve of that speech, Mr. Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter)? I assure you I was very sorry when I read that report, of your comment about your department, and I do say that this is surely a rather frivolous and certainly not a serious expression of opinion about our young people in the schools.

MR. PORTER: I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) that was not a full report of the speech.

MR. NIXON: Good heavens, what could you have said worse than that?

MR. PORTER: It was not as bad as it sounds, if you read the whole thing. However, you know the way they do.

MR. NIXON: "Our secondary schools in recent years have been turning out students who can act in plays , cheer at

foot-ball games, but cannot write or spell properly, and read nothing but crime comics."

MR. PORTER: I think there is probably some truth in that.

MR. NIXON: Well -- I do not know. I am a great admirer of our young people who are graduating from our schools today, Mr.Speaker, and my inclination is to agree much more with the statement the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) made when he was dealing with his Estimates before this House just a few days ago, as reported in the Globe and Mail:

> "Mr. Kennedy differed with those who claimed that young people were not as good as they were in the old days.
>
> "Whenever I read of a man saying that, I think his brains have jelled, and he is finished. He has no conception of the future, and without that vision, people perish".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Now, Mr.Speaker, I do not know when I got such a thrill as I did a couple of weeks ago when the students from the London Normal School were in this Legislature. I think they were a very, very fine class of students indeed. I have never seen a finer aggregation gathered on the floor of this House in the way of visitors, and it really was an inspiration to me when I thought that within a year or two our children were going to be taught by such a fine class of teachers as are being turned out from the London Normal School as exemplified by the delegation which was here on that occasion.

MR. PORTER: I agree with you on that 100 percent.

MR. NIXON: I do suggest to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) -- I agree with him when repudiated -- as I assume he did --the recommendations of the Royal

Commission that qualifications for teachers should be lowered. And I say we have graduating from our universities and colleges this year thousands of well-equipped, splendidly-trained young men and young women, and if he will make the teaching profession attractive, in the way of salaries and other conditions, he can fill his normal schools, and can fill his colleges of education with a very high calibre of teacher students with high qualities, and they can go on as representatives of his Department into these universities -- many of the large number who will be graduating now in just a very few weeks. A good many of them are greatly alarmed at the lack of opportunities opening up, and they would welcome guidance into the teaching profession.

(Take I-1 follows)

Mr. Speaker, I had many other matters here to deal with but I will leave it for discussion on the Estimates. My friend says, "What about the Hope Commission?" There is no question in your mind or in my mind as to what my attitude is towards that Commission. I have it here on my notes that I wrote over two weeks ago, "End of Hope Commission Monstrosity, Give notice to Speaker I will move in supply that the vote of $50,000 be reduced to $1.00." The hon. member for York South (Mr. Jolliffe) rather took the ground out from under me on that.

MR. DOUCETT: Looking at your desk.

MR. NIXON: But he has not changed my opinion on the matter. I have neverhad any use for Royal Commissions of enquiries, I think they are an irresponsible body. They make their examination and they give their report and then they depart as a Commission. I have always advocated in opposition to that form of an inquiry, a committee of the membership of this House as we had so splendidly exemplified in the Conservation Committee this year, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, I do not any longer intend to take the responsibility of voting the taxpayers' money for a continuing of the Hope Commission for education. I had hoped for the division in supply when every hon. member would stand up in his place and be counted, but if that isnot to be the case, then I will certainly support the motion in committee of supply in connection with the amendment now before the House and upon which we will be voting in a few minutes:

> "But this House regrets that recent actual surpluses of record proportions have not been used either to reduce such taxes as the gasoline tax,

"which bear most heavily on the small taxpayer, or to provide immediate relief for the unemployed and extension of other urgent and desirable social welfare services."

I recollect, very well, back in 1945, in winding up the debate on the Speech from the Throne that I announced that it was the intention of the group which I was speaking for, to vote for the C. C. F. amendment, and it occassioned very considerable demonstration in this House. There does not seem to be the same interest today, Mr. Speaker, but in a few short minutes after I announced that, the government was defeated and the House was dissolved and we were in a general election. I say again, it is my intention to vote with the opposition on this amendment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: I had hoped to have some time at my disposal to tell the House the reason why I took that attitude but there does not seem to be the same interest in my announcement as there was in 1945, so I will let the announcement go at that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House for listening to me so patiently, even after I had exceeded the 30-minutes alloted to me.

SOME hon. MEMBER : Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Mr. Speaker, I had intended on this occasion to make what I hope would be sage observations on our experiences during this Session, but I shall restrain myself. I hope I may be permitted to refer, however, to two comments with which I think most hon. members will agree. We have had an unfortunate experience at this occasion, I think an unprecedented

high level of illness and sickness among hon. members of the House. I hope it will not be repeated at future Sessions, but I am disturbed by the number of people who have been forced to stay away from the House by reason of influenza or some other illness. I might say for the record there will be some absent members on the division which is to take place here today on our own side of the House. There will be several who cannot be here by reason of illness. We regret their absence and I take this opportunity of pointing out that is why they are not here. There has been illness on all sides of this House and that leads me to suggest that we should, I think, at future Sessions, endeavor to work in a little more leisurely fashion. I know it is perhaps believed by observers that we do not work very hard when we sit from three in the afternoon till six, but every hon. member in the House knows that the duties of a conscientious hon. member go much further than sitting in this House from three o'clock to six o'clock.

One important duty is committee work and I would hope at the next Session that time will permit the organization of all committees, of all standing committees, an organization meeting before they actually meet to do business so they may elect their chairman and map out their program for the Session. I would also hope that these committees would be able to meet on carefully selected days in such a manner that they will not overlap. There have been occasions in this session when some hon. members have been forced to stay away from a meeting, a committee meeting, because there was another committee meeting which they had to attend at the same time. The result of all this is, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must

accept the necessity of longer Sessions. I share the view expressed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that he has more experience in this House than any of the others here. I share his view that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would be well advised next year to arrange for an earlier Session so we might proceed in a more leisurely fashion and, I think, a somewhat more orderly fashion.

I would like also to refer to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) claim at the outset of his budget speech that he was making his eighth budget speech, or at least he was introducing the motion to go into supply for the eighth time. I know it was his eighth motion to go into supply, but it was only his seventh budget. I was not here during a special session of 1945 but I doubt if there was any special speech by him or anyone else in that perfunctory session.

MR. FROST: It was really a very good one.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has graciously refrained from referring to the seven years in which he has been hon. Provincial Treasurer. I am wondering if possibly the reason may be that he did not want any hon. member of the House to remind him of that Biblical seven years and what followed thereafter. Perhaps I had better not pursue that subject any further. Can it be for this reason, can it be because he has experienced as hon. Provincial Treasurer seven years of plenty due to reasons beyond his control? Can it be for this reason, that he now finds it necessary to dip into the Federal revenues for a share of Federal income tax? I shall say no more

about that, except if there is to be a new provincial tax, the most effective tax which possibly could be imagined is one collected by someone else for which someone else must take the blame, but the one which results in the money coming into your treasury. I remember very clearly the forceful denunciation of that principle by a former Prime Minister (Mr. Drew), who inveighed at great length against any such principle of one authority collecting monies to be expended by another authority. That is now being adopted by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), perhaps bedause he believes it to be necessary.

I would refer also to the very interesting review the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made of the last fifty years in Ontario. Of course, I do not agree with those who claim that half a century has been reached, and I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) should be sufficiently good as a mathematician or statistician to go along with me, that we have not yet passed the half-way mark. Apart from that point, I would commend the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and hon. Provincial Trasurer (Mr. Frost) for his reviewof progress during the past fifty years, subject to some reservations. I think it is well in considering budgets, taxation, revenues and expenditures to keep in mind that more important than figures is the volume of production. Without production there would be no taxes that could be collected, no revenues, no expenditures that could be made of any kind. It is, therefore, more important to refer to the indices of production and to the level of efficiency than to making peremptory, misleading comparisons between the figures of this year and another year. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) very properly pointed

out what has been a great process of industrialization in the last 49 years and in pointing out thatprocess in regard to the volume of production his figures were somewhat exaggerated. True that the value of our dollar has changed on a number of occasions, but, even recognizing the change in the value of the Canadian dollar, it is still true that we have experienced in Ontario a considerable increase in the production of rural wealth, due in a large part to the advances of science, the increased skills of our people and, of course, our increasing population. When the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) proceeded to refer to the great increase in expenditures in welfare services during these same years, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, this increase of welfare service invariably accompanies the processes of industrialization. As a matter of fact, the German nation became industrialized during the 19th century and even under the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, Germany began and extended some of the welfare services which have been more recently accepted in other countries. Even in 19th century Britain, in the Victorian days, when almost everyone accepted the glib teachings of the laissez-faire, even in that day Britain because of industrialization, because of the problems which come with industrialization, laid the foundations of welfare services. They go willy-nilly to every country and to a greater or lesser degree go the process of industrialization. What we in this House must be concerned with is getting the best possible value for every dollar expended on social services. We must be concerned with the need for expending. We must be within the limit of our resources, yes, but even more we must have humane and equitable administration of the

welfare services for which our Provincial Government is responsible.

One other feature of our progress inthe last fifty years emerges very clearly from the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) budget address and that is that our industrialization, with the increase in production, we have become much more sensitive to world markets and international conditions over which we do not have as much control as we would like to have. I am disturbed very much, by the statement that 44¢ out of every dollar earned in exports to the United States is earned by the pulp and paper industry. That is a very heavy percentage. We are clearly very dependent first, on the maintenance of our market for pulp and paper, and, secondly, on the maintenance of the natural resources without which we cannot export the pulp and paper. It is a heavy commitment and it disturbs me that it should be so high. I am not going to refer again to our extraordinary vulnerability in the markets overseas, although I do think that even more serious attention must be given that problem by the government than we hav yet noticed.

There was one set of figures in the budget speech which interested me very much. We have heard during this Session a number of comments about the high cost of manufactured products, particularly the high cost of manufacturing products the farmers must purchase heavily from the agricultural implement manufacturers and others, but, even conceding the high price that farmers must pay today, the high price others must pay for manufactured products, it is very interesting to find that labor's share in the value of the manufacturer's products is less than it was in 1900. That is interesting, is it not?

That is something a good many people did not know. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) told us at page six of his speech that since 1900 the value of our Ontario manufactured products has increased by twenty-five times. The payrolls have increased not twenty-five times, but twenty-three times and I am aware, of course, I am aware that there has been an increase in productivity but there has been also an increase in the number of people employed in industry. The true test is, what is labor's share in the value of the total produced and I know it will surprise many people to learn that even after making the gains of which trade unionists are proud, the workman's share in the total value of Ontario manufactured products today is less than it was in 1900. What f the farming population? It is no greater, in fact, I believe it is perhaps a little less than it was in 1900. The farming population has declined from being more than half of our people fifty years ago to a much smaller percentage today. Well, I have no exact figures, but I do feel rather strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the relative position of the farmer, the average farmer and his family in our society today, is questionable. I have in mind the fact that fifty years ago with a much lower overhead, a much lower tax, much lower cost of production, much less specialized production, fifty years ago there were farms supporting farm families in relative comfort which by today's standards are not supporting families in relative comfort. I have in mind and other hon. members know certain farms, not very good, and not very bad farms which provided a good living fifty years ago, farms where it was possible for every child, sometimes three or four of them, to get a good education, to go to the University of Toronto and

qualify for professional work. As we all know, many people in our civil service and in the professions came from that starting place.

(Take J follows)

The same farms today are quite unable to provide as good a living and with the same advantages that they were able to provide 50 years ago. These are things which I think give pause for thought in reviewing the record of the last 50 years.

I make this simple suggestion, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), that perhaps our overhead is too high. By "overhead" I do not necessarily mean in connection with government; what I am interested in, in connection with government, is value you are getting. If the government service, will save money, and provide a service that is needed, that is a case of getting good value for our money.

But there is an overhead much greater than that of the government services. It seems to me we have had a much higher percentage of people -- particularly in Toronto, and the larger cities -- who perform no useful function; they perform no function which really adds to the value of production, either directly or indirectly. I am thinking, for example, of some of these down-trodden gentry who have had their mailing privileges cut off in the last few days. I may say, in that connection, I do not like theway that is done. I have never liked the procedure of depriving the people of their mailing privileges, without trial, or even without a charge, as far as I know, I think it is unsound, and as a believer in civil liberties and due process of laaw I am "agin" it. I do not care whether the offender is a fraudulent promoter or something else. I do not like it.

But it would appear to me that possibly this drastic step would not have been taken if our security legislation in Ontario were all it should be. As suggested by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) when he took part in this debate, I cannot believe that the federal authorities would have felt impelled to take such drastic steps, perhaps as a

result of American processes, if our security Act were adequate today. There are many people who know it is not adequate. It is not adequate, and not effective, and not working out. I will not go into the details, as they are pretty well known to many hon. members of this House.

I am trying to telescope these remarks, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did not tell us in his speech just what the total provincial expenditures were during the last half century -- at least I do not think he did. In 1900, according to my enquiries, total expenditures of the provincial government were just a shade over $4 million -- just a shade over $4 million. This coming year they will be nearly 100 times as great as in 1900. In the depth of the depression in 1933-1934, the total was $113 million; in 1942 - 1943 -- the last year before the present hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) came into office, they were $102 million. In 1945 - 1946, the first year after the war, they were $135 million; next year approximately $353 million. Except for an error of $30 million or $40 million, one way or the other, which the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) customarily makes in these Estimates. It might be $400 million; it might be much less.

This year a very great change has occurred, and even allowing for the inflated value of our dollar, it is certainly a very great change in the picture.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that on the whole I think most of these expenditures are necessary, and I do not criticize the government for having undertaken them, under these circumstances -- on the whole. But I do say this about it; there is a place for somewhat higher standard of political morality in this province, in connection with public expenditures. I think the standards of morality have risen in recent

years; we do not have the type of scandal there were 50 or 60 or 70 years ago. I think the standards of conduct on the part of public men have improved enormously, and we have not as yet reached the point where the government can resist temptation to make political capital out of the taxpayers' money.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, every man in the government is an honest man and would not think for a moment of feathering his nest -- I mean in a personal sense -- at the public expense.

(Page J-4 follows)

But there is something, Mr. Speaker, which is equally immoral; they brazenly go about telling the people "look at all the money we have given you this year; three times as much as any previous government has given you". Well, it is the tax-payers' money, not that of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). He has no money to give away, but he gets his candidates elected by brazenly boasting and parading these enormous expenditures of the tax-payers' money.

MR. PORTER: It is all on record.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, yes, it is all on record. But I have some literature here, which I can quote. I was surprised to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) boasting about the success of his candidates in the by-elections. I think there is room for the hanging of the head in that regard, and in regard to the propaganda used by the government in Parry Sound and Cochrane North.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: So I have to say there is a place for a higher standard of political morality, particularly in that regard. And particularly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this government, more than any other, has changed its grants systems beyond recognition every year, so often, that they give with one hand, and take away with the other. I am quite sick and tired of it, Mr. Speaker. In one day, I have received furious protests from my constituencies about grants. The first is from the County of York, about the change in hospital grants, and in the same mail, I received a strongly-worded protest from the Board of Education for the Township of York about changing the educational grants. Every year these things are changed, and very often the grant is not larger, but less. My constituents in North York are complaining about a reduction of $118,000. in secondary school grants, and a

reduction in something else, which is not quite clear to me, in the other grants. This means, says the Board of Education, "we will have a net loss of about $69,000. which will have to be made up by direct taxation against the taxpayers of our municipality, and which will add nearly two mills to the rate structure this year."

Obviously the government has no expectation of a by-election in my constituency.

Before I conclude my rambling, and rather hasty remarks, may I offer this tribute to the government of the day, and that is the fact that the government has acted I think courageously, and in my opinion, intelligently on some minor issues -- minor issues. For example, take a thing like the so-called"Sunday sports Bill" or the establishing of a Racing Commission to clean up the situation in that chaotic industry. These issues came to a head very quickly. The government dealt with them expeditiously, with admirable expedition and considerable courage. But they are minor issues. They were the minor issues on which the government takes action; sometimes they take action in a few weeks, and sometimes they take action, realizing that they may be losing a few votes by deciding to do what they think is the right thing to do.

But on major issues, never have I witnessed a government so timorous, so cautious and so procrastinating. You do not get such vigorous action in relation to housing. When they are faced with the problem of housing or unemployment, or the provincial-dominion relations, or the great educational problems, which has been so much to the front in recent years. These are all major issues, and they have been kicked around ever since this government took office.

Nothing definite nor conclusive has been done about any of these, in seven years.

I do not care whether the government continues to boast in by-elections about spending two or three times as much money as any previous government until they can show the taxpayers that they are taking more effecitve action than any previous government in such matters as housing, unemployment, Dominion-Provincial relations, and education. Until they can show that, they are not entitled to the support and confidence of the electors of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will only say a few words in concluding this debate, and I promise I will not take more than four or five minutes.

I want, first of all, to say that this afternoon we have listened to some very interesting contributions to this debate, commencing with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. MacLeod), and ending with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). In all of the addresses we received sidelights to the problems in the life of Ontario, all of which were interesting, and all of which were worthwhile contributions.

Mr. Speaker, that also applies to those who have previously participated in this debate, the financial critic, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) I think delivered a very fine address; He made the best of a very difficult job to criticize this budget, but I think he made an excellent contribution. That has also been true of others who have taken part in the Debate.

All of which, Mr. Speaker, brings me to something about which two or three hon. members have commented, and that is, the Sessions of the Legislature. I quite agree with

what they say. Next year it is my intention to call the Session of the Legislature earlier than on this occasion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I thought myself that perhaps with a Session which did not appear too heavy in the matter of legislation the time which was set was adequate. I think those of us who have been here for a number of years find that we always run into crowded conditions at the end of the Session. That seems to always happen . I spoke to the Right Honourable Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St. Laurent) about that the other day, and he told me that invariably at Ottawa, no matter what arrangements were made, they seemed to run into conditions which are crowded at the end.

I think perhaps we can obviate that by a little better organization as between the parties and the Whips. I think we can arrange to start a little earlier and arrange our work in such a way that we can get rid of the crowded situation in the last week of the Session. That may be a vain hope, but I do not think it is. I think this year we have been very diligent; we have not wasted any time, but in looking back over the seven weeks, I can see places where we might have improved the situation somewhat, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House, that we will learn by the experiences of this Session, and I hope next year we will be able to be even more orderly than we were this year, that we will not, in any sense slight the hon.members of this House, all of whom are capable of making excellent contributions to the affairs of this province, in the speeches which they make.

Now, Mr.Speaker, concerning the budget itself. I will not say anything about the many matters which have been raised by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and other hon. members this afternoon, but reference has been made to the Dominion-Provincial relations. I have some little comment to make in connection with the finance Bills which will be discussed probably tomorrow for a few few minutes, and probably I will touch on the subject of Dominion-Provincial relations at that time. There is one thing, however, I would like to comment on. I know perhaps it is not the most popular thing to comment on in these days. It was a matter raised by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe),namely, the matter of getting the best value for the money we spend. I know it is speculation to talk about these things, but today we are spending an enormous amount of money. I am glad to say to the hon. members of this House that our record here compares very favourably with the other ten provinces. All the governments are having their difficulties in these days with the matter of high costs of government and the lessened purchasing value of the dollar. It reflects itself into our budget. In Ontario we have, I think, in the main, done as well as any of them.

This year we have been able to make even a slight reduction in taxes. Some of the other provinces are having difficulty in that regard, and have had to increase their taxes. We have been fortunate in that we have been able to avoid that situation. Just the same, I can tell the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that I am concerned about the money we spend. I think it is a good thing we should be concerned with the amount of our expenditures. As I have said on a number of occasions here, it is our ability to borrow -- it is our credit-

which stands us in good stead.

I am not so concerned as are some of the hon. members with the increase in our contingent liabilities. It is quite true this coming year they will reach a peak of between $500,000 000. and $600,000,000., and that peak is going to increase. But, nevertheless, if they are all self-liquidating projects, I think it is worthy of our taking a chance with those things.

But I have been concerned through the years I have been connected with the Treasury with very large increases in the net debt, and the increases in our direct tax burden, a burden which is directly tied to our sources of revenue.

Now, I think, Mr.Speaker, we have been living in very free-spending days; we have had the aftermath of the war with free-spending, with the depreciated value of the dollar, and so forth. But, just the same, a dollar is a dollar, and I think we must remember that beside the fact of our increased production in Ontario and Canada, still the increases of the cost of things must come to an end somewhere.

As an export nation and an export province we must particularly remember that the costs of government are in the end reflected in the cost of goods which we are able to export from this country, and the prospects of building up markets, and competing in the markets of the world.

As has been said by many hon. members on both sides of the House, we are an export nation; we are an export country, and we are an export province, and on our ability to sell on the markets of the world, our standard of living and our prosperity depend. I am most conscious of the fact that we very seldom now hear speeches on the matter of economy. That does not seem to be the story, but just the same, Mr. Speaker, that is the basic thing, the getting good value for every

dollar we spend.

I may say in the last few days I have called together the heads of all the Departments -- the Civil Service heads of the Departments -- and discussed that problem with them. I have discussed it fully, and I can assure the hon. members of this House that it is something I consider to be a matter of the utmost importance. The dollar saved, if it is soundly saved, is better than a dollar that is gained by way of additional taxation on our people. I think these are things we could well consider.

I was most interested in the comments of some of the hon. members relative to that problem, this afternoon.

(Take K-1 follows)

Mr. Speaker, I will not say any more than this, other than of course I am disappointed that my hon. friend, the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and some other hon. members will not be voting with us, I had hoped that at least we would have had a fairly large segment of support from the Opposition, I thought, on a Budget which was sound and good. I admit there might perhaps be some ground for criticism. I would criticize perhaps some things myself, but it is difficult in these troubled days to get everything to our entire satisfaction, but I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, we would have had, as I say, a considerable segment of hon. members opposite voting with us on this occasion.

However, I can only say the government throws itself on the House and is hopeful that we will be supported by the majority of the House and enabled to carry on during the balance of this term of the Legislature.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frost moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Wismer moves, seconded by Mr. Jolliffe, that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, be amended by adding thereto the following:

> "This House regrets that recent actual surplusses of record proportions have not been used either to reduce such taxes as the gasoline tax which bear most heavily on the small taxpayer, or to provide immediate relief for the unemployed and extension of other urgent and desirable social welfare services."

The vote is on the amendment. Call in the hon. members.

The amendment negatived on Division.

Yeas -- 27

Nays -- 47

MR. SPEAKER: The vote is now on the main motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Same Division?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is all right with me.

The motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I shall make a motion in just a moment, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when we adjourn, we adjourn until 11.00 o'clock in the morning, and then we will proceed as arranged last week with Bill No. 82, I believe-- the order relating to the Labour Bill, in any event.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that tomorrow, Tuesday, the 4th instant, and each sitting day for the balance of the present week this Assembly will meet at 11.00 o'clock in the forenoon and rise for recess at 1.00 o'clock in the afternoon, and resume at 2.00 o'clock in the afternoon, and that provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they may apply to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has pointed out that after the passage of that motion, it is usual to go into Supply and pass one item. I think the House may waive that, in view of the fact we have passed a good many estimates, and I do not think it is necessary to do that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: As a matter of fact, we are in the middle of one right now, of course.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: That is right. The hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) held forth into the evening session.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table before the House adjourns, the answer to question number 74, which gives some very interesting information relative to the expenditures. There will be a night session tomorrow night.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.01 o'clock p. m.

- - - - - - -